

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. 164.

PUBLISHED IN

JANUARY & APRIL, 1887.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1887.

AP4
Q25
V164

1881

QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. 164

1881

LONDON:

Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and SONS, Limited,
Stamford Street and Charing Cross.

CONTENTS

OF

No. 327.

Art.	Page
I.—The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G. By Edwin Hodder. With Portraits. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1886 - - - -	1
II.—1. The London University Calendar, 1886-7.	
2. Reports of the Association for promoting a Teaching University for London.	
3. Minutes of Convocation of the University of London, 1885-6.	
4. Report of International Conference on Education, 1884. Vol. III. University Education. London, 1884.	
5. L'Université de Londres. Par M. Buisson; Ancien élève de l'école normale supérieure. Paris, 1879 -	33
III.—1. Naukratis; Part I, 1884-5; the third Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund. By W. M. Flinders Petrie; with chapters by Cecil Smith, Ernest Gardner, and Barclay V. Head. London, 1886.	
2. Geschichte Aegyptens, von Psammetich I. bis auf Alexander den Grossen. Von Dr. Alfred Wiedemann. Leipzig, 1880 - - - -	66
IV.—1. The Pictorial Arts of Japan. By William Anderson, F.R.C.S. London, 1886.	
2. Descriptive and Historical Catalogue of a Collection of Chinese and Japanese Pictures in the British Museum. Published by order of the Trustees. By William Anderson, F.R.C.S. London, 1886.	
3. The Ornamental Arts of Japan. By George Ashdown Audsley. London, 1886 - - - -	97

- V.—1. The Expansion of England. By J. R. Seeley, M.A. London, 1884.
2. By the West to the East. Memorandum on some Imperial Aspects of the Completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. London, March 1886.
3. Parliamentary Debates. Canadian *Hansard*. 1880-1-2-3-4-5.
4. Canadian Pacific Railway: Annual Report for 1885 - 119
- VI.—HOBSON JOBSON: being a Glossary of Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases and of kindred terms: Etymological, Geographical, and Discursive. By Colonel Henry Yule, R.E., C.B., LL.D.; and the late Arthur Coke Burnell, Ph.D., C.I.E. London, 1886 - - - - - 144
- VII.—1. Report of the Royal Commission on Church Patronage, 1879.
2. Church Patronage Bill, as amended by the Select Committee of the House of Lords, June 1886 - - 167
- VIII.—1. Handbuch der historisch-geographischen Pathologie. Von Dr. August Hirsch; 2te vollständig neue Bearbeitung. 3 Bände. Stuttgart, 1881-86.
2. Handbook of Geographical and Historical Pathology. By Dr. August Hirsch. Translated by Charles Creighton, M.D. 3 vols. London, 1883-86. (New Sydenham Society) - - - - - 193
- IX.—1. England and Russia face to face in Asia. Travels with the Afghan Boundary Commission. By Lieutenant A. C. Yate. London, 1887.
2. Persia and the Persians. By S. G. W. Benjamin, lately Minister of the United States to Persia. London, 1887.
3. The Armed Strength of Russia. Prepared in the Intelligence Branch of the War Office. By Captain J. M. Grierson, R.A. London (published under the superintendence of H.M.'s Stationery Office), 1886 - 218
- X.—Petition addressed to the Hebdomadal Council for the Foundation of a School of Modern Literature. Oxford: Printed at the Clarendon Press, 1886 - 241
- XI.—Public Journals for December 1886 and January 1887- 270

CONTENTS

OF

No. 328.

ART.	Page
I.—The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley. By Edward Dowden, LL.D., Professor of English Literature in the University of Dublin. 2 vols. London, 1886.	285
II.—1. The Life and Writings of Charles Leslie, M.A., Nonjuring Divine. By the Rev. R. J. Leslie. London, 1885.	
2. William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic. By the Rev. J. H. Overton. London, 1881	322
III.—Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Leslie Stephen. Vols. I.—X. Abbadie.—Clarkson. London, 1885—7	350
IV.—1. History of Antiquities of the County of Suffolk, with genealogical and architectural notices of its several towns and villages. By the Rev. Alfred Suckling, Rector of Barsham. London, 1848.	
2. Murray's Handbook to the Eastern Counties. London, 1875.	
3. An Historical Account of Dunwich, antiently a city, now a borough; Blithburgh, formerly a town of note, now a village; Southwold, once a village, now a town corporate, &c. By Thomas Gardiner. London, 1754.	
4. The Suffolk Garland, or East Country Minstrel. Ipswich, 1818.	
5. The New Suffolk Garland. Compiled by John Glyde, Jun. Ipswich, 1860	382
And other Works.	
V.—Hobbes. By George Croom Robertson, Grote Professor of Mind and Logic in University College, London. Edinburgh and London, 1886	415

Art.	Page
VI.—1. Agricultural Returns of Great Britain for 1886. London, 1886.	
2. Statistical Abstract for the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom. London, 1885.	
3. Report of the American Department of Agriculture for 1885. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1886.	
4. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1885. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1886.	
5. Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada, 1885. Ottawa, 1886.	
6. Statistical Abstract for Canada, 1886. - - -	445
And other Works.	
VII.—1. Christophe Plantin, Imprimeur Anversois. Par Max Rooses, Conservateur du Musée Plantin-Moretus. Anvers, 1882.	
2. Correspondance de Christophe Plantin. Publiée par Max Rooses. Anvers. Vol. I. 1883, Vol. II. 1885.	
3. La Maison Plantin à Anvers. Monographie complète de cette Imprimerie célèbre, Documents historiques sur l'Imprimerie, etc. Par Léon Degeorge. Paris, 1886. - - -	475
And other Works.	
VIII.—1. History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815. By Spencer Walpole. Vols. III.—V. London, 1880–1886.	
2. The Greville Memoirs (Second Part). A Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852. By the late Charles C. F. Greville, Esq., Clerk of the Council. 3 vols. London, 1885.	
3. The Greville Memoirs (Third Part), 1852–1860. 2 vols. London, 1887. - - -	507
IX.—1. England's Case against Home Rule. By A. V. Dicey, B.C.L. Third Edition. London, 1886.	
2. Why England maintains the Union. Being the substance of 'England's Case Against Home Rule.' By Professor A. V. Dicey, prepared for popular use by C.E.S. London, 1887.	
3. Industrial Ireland. By Robert Dennis. London, 1887.	
4. Ireland's Progress, 1782–1800–1886. Dublin, 1886.	
5. The Law of the Land. An Address delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution at the opening of its Session, November, 1886. E. J. Phelps -	541
And other Works.	

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

ART. I.—*The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.* By Edwin Hodder. With Portraits. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1886.

THE natural desire of all classes in England to have in their hands, as soon as possible, a full and authentic biography of the great philanthropist of the century, has been gratified sooner than could have reasonably been expected, by the appearance of Mr. Hodder's three large volumes. Of the speed with which he has accomplished his enterprise a partial explanation is to be found in the fact that he had commenced the execution of it a year before Lord Shaftesbury's death, under that venerable nobleman's own direction; and that during many months of close personal intercourse he had the advantage of being allowed to take down, pen in hand, from his lips the story of his life as he himself narrated it. But a still more important light is thrown upon the author's rapid workmanship by the lines which he decided to lay down for the construction of his memorial work. The Earl left behind him many bulky manuscript volumes of journals, diaries, and note-books, extending over the whole course of his prolonged life, and forming altogether an almost complete autobiography. During an illness, a very few years before his death, when occupying his forced inaction by looking over old papers and documents, and setting them aside for destruction, he had thrown into a heap, to undergo this fate, the entire collection of these personal records which had accumulated up to that date. It so happened, however, that before the sentence was executed upon them a return of health brought them a momentary reprieve; and other cares intervening, the respite became lengthened, until it grew into a final remission of the capital penalty. In this way it came about that the whole of these invaluable materials survived, to pass into Mr. Hodder's hands for his free and unfettered use; and as a matter

of fact, the extracts taken bodily from them form the main bulk of his work. As he remarks in his preface, 'It has been my endeavour to let the record of Lord Shaftesbury's whole life-work be told, as much as possible, in his own words.'

It is obvious that on these lines the task became much easier and more capable of rapid performance than it would have been, had Mr. Hodder set before him the higher aim of constructing anything approaching to a critical biography—a biography which should trace carefully the inner growth of its subject's mind, analyse his character, harmonize his peculiarities, and construct out of the raw materials a complete and final portrait of the man. The fact that such a treatment of the subject as this has been entirely foreign to the writer's purpose makes the present work, full of interest as it is, rather a collection of materials for some future biographer's use, than a performance which can hope to take rank as the standard and monumental record of so noble and prominent a personage. For an achievement of this more arduous nature a firmer and more skilful hand is needed; a hand which will not only weed out a large quantity of trivial or irrelevant matter, but shall also possess that constructive power which alone can make the departed live again before us in their veritable 'form and pressure.'

That Mr. Hodder has been wise in refraining from the attempt to present to the world a work, which aspires to be a finished and perennial monument of the great noble, we discern plain tokens in the preface, from which we have already quoted his own account of his purpose and method. It there appears that Lord Shaftesbury had laid down with imperative emphasis the condition, that his biographer should tell 'the *reality*, be it good, or be it bad, and not a sham;' and this, as much as regarded his religious views and action as his philanthropical aims and labours. His words to that effect are precise and interesting:—

'My religious views are not popular, but they are the views that have sustained and comforted me all through my life. They have never been disguised, nor have I ever sought to disguise them. I think a man's religion, if it is worth anything, should enter into every sphere of life and rule his conduct in every relation. I have always been, and, please God, always shall be, an Evangelical of the Evangelicals, and no biography can represent me that does not fully and emphatically represent my religious views.'

Of course Mr. Hodder has been right in considering himself absolutely bound by the injunction thus laid upon him; what we call attention to is his comment upon it. He concludes his preface as follows:—

'I have

'I have made no endeavour, therefore, to tone down his strong Protestantism; his unshaken and unshakable belief in Scripture, in dogma, and in prayer. If he was wrong here, he was wrong throughout, for he was a man with a single aim; his labours in the field of politics sprang from his philanthropy; his philanthropy sprang from his deep and earnest religious convictions; and every labour, political, benevolent, and religious, was begun, continued, and ended in one and the same spirit.'

Now we submit that this comment betrays a lack of discrimination, which augurs ill for the success of any attempt on Mr. Hodder's part to deal thoroughly with the analysis and portraiture of character. Lord Shaftesbury was speaking of his own peculiar and 'unpopular religious views;' not of the religious convictions which are the common inheritance of Christians, but of the special form in which he held Christianity, the rigid and somewhat narrow dogmatism characteristic of extreme 'Evangelicals.' His biographer, apparently not alive to the distinction between the vital *substance* of a creed, and the different *forms* in which it may be held and expressed by different schools of thought, argues that if Lord Shaftesbury was wrong in the peculiarities which made his religious views unpopular, he was wrong in everything, since it was in these that all his labours, political, benevolent, and religious, were vitally rooted. But this is manifestly contrary to reason, and untrue. The magnificent and untiring devotion to his suffering fellow-creatures, by which Lord Shaftesbury's life was ennobled, was undoubtedly rooted in his personal religion,—in his grasp on Christianity as the revelation of the Divine love,—in his faith in the Saviour whose Spirit he had caught, and in whose steps he endeavoured to follow. But those special peculiarities and minor aspects of belief, those 'religious views,' which distinguished him from the majority of his fellow-Christians and even of his fellow-Churchmen, had no more to do with the warmth and vigour of his charity, than the spots on the sun's face have to do with the flood of light and heat wherewith it quickens the teeming earth. If anything, it was rather in spite of these petty idiosyncracies that his large-heartedness triumphed over all personal considerations, and consummated the sacrifice of self; for of such views the natural and logical tendency is more to contract than to enlarge the blessed embrace of beneficence. As a matter of fact, the renowned heroes of charity have been confined to no particular school of Christian thought, to no one communion of ecclesiastical order and discipline. Every form of Christianity has contributed to the noble army, whether Roman, or Greek, or Reformed, whether Anglican or Noncon-

formist, whether High Church, Broad Church, or Low Church. Had Lord Shaftesbury, instead of being, as he styled himself, 'an Evangelical of the Evangelicals,' happened to hold the views, say of Pusey, or of Maurice, or even of St. Francis and St. Vincent de Paul, there is no reason to suppose that the love of his fellow-men for Christ's sake would have burned less brightly in his soul, or been a less prolific source of 'labours more abundant' for their good. It is poor work to try to make capital for any peculiar form of the Christian creed out of excellences which are the glory of the creed at large; and we must protest against the giving up to party what is in truth the ornament of our common Christianity.

We have ventured to look forward to some future biographer, who will skilfully employ the abundant accessible materials in constructing a full and final portraiture of one, who played so remarkable a part in the social history of our time, and grew so deeply into the heart of the English nation. We are persuaded that the task will be easier in this case than it has proved in many others. Lord Shaftesbury's mind and character were thoroughly English, and singularly free from complexity. As we study him in his own ample records of his thoughts, feelings, and actions, scarcely anything stands out more prominently than his transparent simplicity and straightforwardness—the absence from his mental structure of all subtlety, versatility, or manifoldness. Even that there should be two sides to a question, two views which are complementary to each other, never appears to occur to him. His ideas were evidently of slow growth in his early manhood, but when once formed they became stereotyped, and admitted of no enlargement or modification. While the world was in ferment around him, and new knowledge, flowing in from every quarter, was remoulding in many particulars the forms even of religious beliefs and modes of conception, he simply stood immovable on the ground he had occupied, and not merely looked askance at, but loudly denounced, every innovation that fell under his notice. Mr. Hodder illustrates this 'singular identity in views, in principles, and in the modes of enforcing them,' by saying that 'many passages upon many subjects might be extracted from the Note-book of 1834, and inserted in the Diary of 1884, without any fear of detection.' It is true that such immobility of mind has its inconveniences. When all are moving on, to stand still is to be left behind, and the result is uncomfortable isolation, loss of sympathy, and rupture of cherished ties. From these consequences Lord Shaftesbury, as we shall see, was by no means exempt. But to the biographer or student of character this singleness, this
unchanging

unchanging persistence, of intellectual perception and habit presents no such perplexing problems as those which arise in the case of minds that are discursive, manysided, and subtle, and which play freely around the subjects on which they labour, with a delicate sensitiveness to every fresh impulse arising out of new knowledge and widening experience.

That we do not exaggerate the intellectual simplicity which we conceive to have been one of Lord Shaftesbury's most essential characteristics, a very few extracts from his papers will be sufficient to show; and we shall be surprised if those which we select for the purpose, illustrated by their respective dates, do not provoke a good-natured smile. Our earliest is an entry under date Sunday, Sept. 24, 1828, when he was twenty-seven years old, had been an Oxford first-class man, had sat for several years in the House of Commons, and was actually holding high office as Commissioner on the India Board of Control. It refers to an evening visit to Sir J. South's observatory at Kensington, and is as follows:—

'Saw the planet Saturn and his ring; it is a spectacle worthy of God alone. Man has not beauty of soul sufficient to comprehend such majestic loveliness. I thanked God that I had enjoyed so great a blessing. It came as a reward for obedience to very painful duty.'

We pass on half a year, and come to another Sunday's entry:

'This morning read all the Revelation continuously. This, or these readings of this kind, will make the general scope more easy of comprehension.'

If it be thought that the date even of these illustrations of his simple way of looking at things is too early to afford a fair view of his mind's action, we will advance nine years, and reach the time when the name of Ashley had become as familiar throughout the Empire as a household word. It happened that political circumstances had induced the Government in 1838 to appoint a Vice-Consul at Jerusalem, and here is the comment upon it:—

'If this is duly considered, what a wonderful event it is! The ancient city of the people of God is about to resume a place among the nations, and England is the first of Gentile kingdoms to cease to tread her down.'

Three years later, when he was forty, and had become one of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric was founded at Jerusalem, to his unbounded thankfulness and joy; for he saw in it the earnest of a 'combination of Protestant thrones, bound by temporal interests and eternal principles, to
plant

plant under the banner of the Cross God's people on the mountains of Jerusalem.' On the passing of the enabling Act of Parliament, he writes:—

'Sept. 23.—The Bill for creating the Bishopric of Jerusalem passed last night! May the blessing of the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, be with it now and for ever! I wish I had put down in detail the whole proceedings of this wonderful measure, of all I have said, felt, and done in it; but time has failed me for half of the things I would perform or write. All I can say is that, under God's especial blessing, *pars magna fui*.'

But the climax of his triumphant delight came shortly afterwards, when his request, that the Government would lend a steamboat to carry out the new Bishop, was to his surprise granted. The ring of his exultation and the vastness of his hopes may be perceived in the following entry:—

'Oct. 25.—Wonderfully surprised—received yesterday a short note from Peel, stating that "orders would be given for an Admiralty steamboat to carry out the Bishop to Syria"! Had I not been almost accustomed, so to speak, to God's mercies, I should have disbelieved it. "Surely the isles shall wait for thee, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from afar and thy daughters from the ends of the earth!"'

The wonderful and naive simplicity, which the foregoing extracts show to have been a permanent feature of the Earl's mind, was, it is almost needless to add, accompanied by a sincerity on which no shadow ever could rest; and joined to this was the still more precious working quality of a truly British tenacity of purpose, in pursuing the philanthropical enterprises to which he felt that the Divine Providence had called him. All thought of his own ease and comfort was resolutely flung to the winds, and every faculty of mind and body was strained to the utmost to ensure success. The story of his struggles will occupy our attention presently; here it is the mind, the character, which lay beneath them that we desire briefly to indicate. Profoundly religious, invincibly honest, grandly unsparing of himself, vigorous, if also narrow and rigid, in the play of his intellect—all this he was beyond question; but to these qualities must be added a rarer and more exquisite one, which suffused all the rest with a winning beauty, and assumed such imperial command over them as to be the very mainspring of his conduct. This was an inexhaustible tenderness—a tenderness which brooded over the domestic hearth, embracing wife and children and filling his home with love; and thence flowed out in perennial streams to lavish its wealth upon

upon the unprotected and suffering wherever they were found. Aristocrat as he was, every inch of him, and never unconscious of his rank—so evidently so as to elicit the remark from one of his order, that ‘Lord Shaftesbury was the proudest man he knew;’ and fighting athlete, too, as he stood out before the world, ever throwing himself with unquenchable pugnacity into the battle of humanity; there were few men nearer whose eyes the tears lay, or whose hearts were more open to be wrung by the pangs of sympathy with others’ woes. Mr. Hodder writes truly when he says:—

‘By day and by night the wailing of the world’s sorrow haunted him; the cry of the children rang ceaselessly in his ears; and it was no figure of speech he used when those who saw his cheeks grow paler, and his face more sad, asked of him the cause, and he answered with choking voice, “I have been in a perfect agony of mind about my poor boys!”’

Such, in our view, were the main characteristics of this remarkable man; and, take him for all in all, we think there can be no hesitation in pronouncing, that of all the persons who have filled a large space in the world’s eye, none was ever more transparent or simple.

How he grew up into fitness for his life-work we must briefly notice, before we attempt to sketch in outline the career of his mature manhood. He was born in the first spring of the century, ten years before his father succeeded to the title; and was sent at the tender age of seven to a private school at Chiswick, which, although fashionable, had become through scandalous mismanagement such a den of abominations, that down to his old age the Earl used to say that the memory of it made him shudder; there never was such a wicked school, before or since; the place was bad, wicked, filthy; the treatment starvation and cruelty. Nor was there any tenderness at home to counterbalance the gloom and misery of the school. No paternal solicitude, no sweet mother’s love, fell to his lot. The only friend of his childhood was a faithful old housekeeper, who taught him his first prayer, the artless words of which would rise to his lips even in the decline of life; and who bequeathed to him her gold watch, the only one he ever wore, which he often showed with the remark, that it was given him by the best friend he ever had. But for this single alleviation, his existence, till he was transferred to Harrow in his thirteenth year, was a time of unrelieved depression and suffering through neglect and tyranny; the effect of which on his temperament was ineffaceable. Those who knew him best in his subsequent career could discern the traces of his early wretchedness in the
habitual

habitual touch of sadness which mingled with all his activity, and betrayed itself alike in the expression of his features when in repose, and the somewhat sombre and melancholy mood in which he entertained the interests and encountered the vicissitudes of life. But his unhappy experience in childhood brought with it a spiritual gain, to compensate for the loss of bright and elastic cheerfulness. There is abundance of evidence to show, that the recollection of his own early miseries burnt into his sensitive nature an undying hatred of tyranny, and an irrepressible sympathy for its victims; and thus helped to equip him to become the ardent champion of the unprotected and ill-used, of oppressed women and children, of the 'waifs and strays'—those pitiful outcasts who crowd the dark corners of the stately structure of our civilization.

His three years at Harrow were marked by an incident worth recording, because he himself traced back to it the earliest impulse to the choice of his mature manhood. Walking alone one day down the hill, he encountered a drunken group shouting out Bacchanalian songs, as they staggered along with a coffin containing the remains of a deceased comrade. Presently turning a corner they let their burden slip from their nerveless hands, and broke out into foul and horrible language. Struck with unspeakable horror at the ghastly scene, the lad, after gazing at it for a few moments as if spell-bound, registered a vow that with God's help he would make the cause of the poor his own. Nearly seventy years afterwards, by a remarkable coincidence, it was on the very same spot that he related this anecdote to the Head-master, Dr. Butler, now the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, in answer to a casual question, whether any particular incident had led him to dedicate his life to the cause of the poor and wretched.

On leaving Harrow the young Lord Ashley (for so we must call him till his accession to the earldom in his fifty-first year) was transferred to the care of a private tutor, a family connection, who lived in Derbyshire, and where, if he learned nothing else, he acquired a taste for the innocent pleasures of a rustic existence. Going up thence at eighteen to Christ Church, Oxford, he began to take life in greater earnest, and made up for lost time by such exemplary assiduity in his studies, that to his own intense surprise he came out of the schools a first-class man in Classics in 1822. Little is recorded of him after this, till in his twenty-sixth year he entered Parliament as member for Woodstock after a severe contest; but there is a retrospective entry in his diary, dated on his twenty-fifth birthday, which shows that he had travelled abroad in the interval, and passed

passed through a very serious *affaire de cœur*. On this his biographer indulges us with no comment, and probably he was as ignorant as ourselves of the circumstances; but the brief record is too curious and indeed surprising to be passed over. Here it is:—

‘Latterly I have taken to hard study. It amuses me and prevents mischief. Occasionally the question “*cui bono*” sours my spirit of application; but generally speaking, I have stilled the passions. An attachment during my residence at Vienna commenced a course of self-knowledge for me. Man never has loved more furiously or more imprudently. The object was, and is, an angel, but she was surrounded by, and would have brought with her, a halo of hell.’

It is obvious that Lord Ashley's earliest years as a member of the Legislature were a very important season of mental growth, notwithstanding a constitutional shyness and diffidence which made it a pleasure to him to pass unnoticed. We can see that his religion had already established for itself a paramount influence over his conduct; and that he was habitually looking upwards for guidance and help, and carrying out the resolve to preserve his conscience unsullied. Social ties and enthusiastic admiration of the Duke of Wellington kept him in the main on the Tory side; and when in the spring of 1827 Canning, on succeeding Lord Liverpool, offered him a post in the Government, he refused it chiefly out of loyalty to the Duke, much as the income was needed by him owing to his father's niggardliness. ‘With me,’ he writes in his journal, ‘the Duke is the chief consideration.’ When in the following year, on Canning's death, the Duke resumed office, Ashley found his reward in a seat on the India Board of Control, which he occupied for two years, until Earl Grey's accession to power. Of his feelings during those first years of public life his Diaries furnish an ample record. Strange as it now seems, the most intrusive of them all was self-mistrust, one of the last for which those who knew him only in riper age would have given him credit. It was continually finding secret utterance in one form or another. Here is a short catena of such private confessions, with their dates:—

‘1827. April 1.—Would to heaven I could quit public life, and sink down into an ambition proportionate to my capacity! But I am cursed with honourable desires (they are so) and by predestined failure. This keeps spurring me on to desperation. What a happy fate to lose all hope, all aspiring sentiment, all nobleness of thought, all daring of mind, all wish for greater things! I had rather be creeping and contented, than aspiring and inefficient. It is a curse of tantalisation; *vide* all my thoughts throughout this book.

‘April

'April 18.—The State may want me, wretched ass as I am!

'1828. Jan. 24.—Received a note from the Duke to-day desiring my attendance to-morrow morning. What can he want? To give me office—then Heaven help me through it. Perhaps to move the Address. Any fate would be preferable.

'1829. Feb. 5.—Parliament begins to-day, and with it comes the beginning of sorrows. This evening I must speak. . . . Now, O God, without whom there falleth not a sparrow to the ground, neither can there pass from the mouth one word of wisdom, give me Thy aid, save me from failure and disgrace. *Half-past ten.*—I have spoken; I am but just saved from disgrace.

'Feb. 7.—Went on a visitation of madhouses. I can do good that way if in no other.

'Feb. 11.—God is all wise and all good, and I am sure that He has made me inferior to others for some kind purpose. I am, however, unpleasantly situated; in honour I must go on, yet only to exposure. I pray night and day for His grace and assistance.'

It will be right to bear in mind these confessions of humble self-distrust, penned for no eye but his own, when we come across the Lord Shaftesbury of later years, surrounded by a well-meaning but narrow-minded clique of flatterers, who took his every word for Gospel, and by their foolish adulation tempted him to assume too often the demeanour of a Protestant Pope, and scatter his denunciations with little less than the infallibility of the Vatican in its proudest days.

It may be mentioned once for all here, that, down to his own accession to the Earldom, Lord Ashley suffered deeply, both in his heart and his material circumstances, from the estrangement of his parents. With very fitful gleams of better feeling it was life-long. Once, in 1839, after ten years of exile from the ancestral seat, a reconciliation took place with his father, and for several years more cordial relations prevailed; but the old bitterness gradually came back. The writer of these pages can recollect, when visiting the aged Countess at Richmond in 1847, hearing her speak with pride of 'her boy Ashley'; but this tardy sentiment brought no relief from pecuniary embarrassment. In the Diaries we find frequent complaints of the pressure on his purse, and the lowness of his finances, as crippling, not his own enjoyments, but his power of helping the helpless. The following entry on the last day of 1846 speaks for itself:—

'Cæsar would be pauperised if he were to meet half the demands that are made upon me every month! Alas, I must refuse the largest proportion, and give very sparingly to the remainder. I say "alas," because the cases are often meritorious, and I shall always be misrepresented and frequently misunderstood. Many people choose to believe that I am rich, and ask accordingly; yet more than half of
my

my income is borrowed, to be repaid at some future day, with heavy accumulations of interest; eight children, the two eldest costing me more than 200*l.* a year each; a ninth coming, and an allowance from my father of only 100*l.* annually more than I had as a bachelor at Oxford!

Turning back to Lord Ashley's earlier life, we find him, under date November 1828, summing up his bitter reflections on the unkindness of his parents to all their children with these melancholy words:—'The history of our father and mother would be incredible to most men, and perhaps it would do no good if such facts were recorded.' Probably it was this experience which prompted the frequent yearnings for a domestic hearth of his own, which we come across in those years. In September 1827, he writes:—'If I could find the creature I have invented, I should love her with a tenderness and truth unprecedented in the history of wedlock. I pray for her abundantly. God grant me this purest of blessings!' A year afterwards, there is this entry:—'In solitude very often of late I somehow begin to feel how truly God pronounced, "It is not good for man to be alone."' A little later, moralizing on marriage, he says that he dreads the chance of a Jezebel, a Cleopatra, or that insupportable compound of folly and worldliness which experience displays every day, and cries out, 'Give me the mother of the Gracchi, exalted by the Gospel!' Once more, on the Christmas day of 1829, he exclaims, 'What a purity of delight if God would bestow on me the wife of my heart, and a place for the exercise of imagined virtues!' Of these desires the fulfilment was granted him in June 1830, when he married Lady Emily Cowper, daughter of the future Lady Palmerston, 'a wife as good, as true, and as deeply loved,' he fondly wrote in the evening of his life, 'as God ever gave to man'—'the bright and beautiful woman,' to borrow Lord Granville's phrase, 'who threw so much sunshine on his home,' and for forty years animated his efforts, shared his struggles, and ministered encouragement to him in his hours of dejection.

During those early Parliamentary years Lord Ashley was unconsciously waiting for his vocation. We find him fervently aspiring to be useful in his generation, and to die in the knowledge of having advanced happiness by having advanced true religion; but his line of action was not yet made clear to him. He was drifting on the current of life, ready to obey some decisive impulse which seemed slow to come. At one time physical science, especially astronomy, attracted him strongly; then literature beckoned him to become its follower. But those inclinations passed away. By his two years of service at the India

India Board he acquired a taste for benevolent projects, if only he could discover how to set about them. Then his appointment to be a Commissioner in Lunacy, a post which his death alone vacated, opened to him a sphere of work which was a good training for wider philanthropical labours. Yet it was not till 1833 that the decisive call came, which determined the future complexion of his life. Circumstances then placed him at the parting of the ways. Should he pursue a political career, and seek the high offices which in the ordinary course of things seemed within his reach? Or should he turn his back on power, wealth, and comparative ease, to fling himself into a ceaseless struggle for the poor and oppressed? Compelled to choose between the alternatives, he laid the matter before his wife, painting in dark colours the sacrifices the latter would entail, and the burden it would lay on her young shoulders, and awaited the verdict from her lips. It came without hesitation. 'It is your duty; the consequences we must leave. Go forward, and to victory!'

The die was thus cast, the Rubicon crossed, and this was how the critical moment arrived. In the latter part of the last century, owing to the development of machinery and the application of steam-power, an enormous extension had been given to the cotton manufactures of England. The great centres where they were carried on became studded with vast mills, surrounded by a densely crowded population; and a demand for the labour of women and children had been created, which gave rise to frightful abuses and cruelties. A traffic, as revolting as the slave-traffic of Africa, had sprung up; gangs of child-jobbers scoured the country to entrap or purchase thousands of little children of either sex, from five years old and upwards, to sell them into the bondage of factory slaves. The misery and the waste of life were terrible. Day and night the iron wheels of the unresting machinery droned and burred with maddening iteration; and amidst the unceasing din, in an atmosphere polluted by stench and thick with the choking 'flew' of the cotton, myriads of these tender little victims were forced to labour, under the lash of brutal overlookers, till nature gave way, or death brought a merciful release. During the first quarter of the present century several attempts were made to alleviate these horrors by legislative enactments, but, what with the influence of the great millowners, and the jealousy of the political economists, no effectual remedy was applied. At length, in 1831, Mr. Sadler, the Member for Newark, took up the question in earnest, and introduced into the House of Commons the famous 'Ten Hours Bill,' the object of which

was

was to restrict the labour both of women and children in the cotton-mills to ten hours daily. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee, but further progress was barred by the Reform Bill of the following year; and at the ensuing general election Mr. Sadler failed to obtain a seat in Parliament.

It was at this conjuncture that the delegates of the operatives, looking about to discover a champion for their cause, turned to Lord Ashley, who was now sitting for Dorsetshire, and had already begun to be known as the 'Workman's Friend,' and entreated him to step into the gap, and fight their battle on the floor of the House of Commons. The feelings with which he received the proposal have been placed on record by himself. 'I can perfectly recollect,' he wrote long afterwards, 'my astonishment, doubt, and terror, at the proposition.' He begged till next morning for consideration, took counsel of one or two friends, went home to consult his wife and seek guidance in prayer, and on the following day resolutely put his hand to the plough by giving notice in Parliament, that he would move the re-introduction of the Ten-Hours Bill.

The conflict, then begun, lasted for fourteen years. This is not the place to relate in any detail the vicissitudes of it; we can only note its general features. The resistance took various forms, according to circumstances. Not one of the successive Administrations would adopt in earnest the cause of the oppressed factory hands. New commissions of enquiry were instituted as instruments of obstruction and delay. Half-measures were brought forward as rivals, to displace the measure which was thorough; even retrograde measures were attempted, to undo any partial good which former legislation had effected. Then there were sessions, too crowded with the conflicts of political parties, to allow time to think of the grinding slavery of the workers in the mills. But against all obstacles and through all delays Lord Ashley held on to his persistent purpose. No looking back from the plough for him! Capitalists might storm, prime-ministers might delude with mocking promises, corn-law agitators might revile, political economists might condemn, even 'the sixteen thousand ordained ministers of Christ's Gospel' might, through indifference, timidity, or suspicion, stand aloof and justify his complaint that, as a body, 'they have done, are doing, and will do, nothing;' to Lord Ashley it mattered not. He set his face like a flint; and what his steadfast resolve was throughout the conflict may be read in the words penned in his diary for August 27th, 1841:—

'Fresh difficulties beset my path. The Master spinners have held a meeting in Manchester, and have resolved to oppose *any* bill that I

CAN

can bring in. This determines much of my course. I knew what I should do before; I now can guess what Peel will do: he will succumb to the capitalists and reject my Factory Bill. No human power, therefore, shall induce me to accept office. I am bound by every obligation, human and divine, not to allow myself to be placed in any situation where I may not be equally, if not better, circumstanced to advance these great interests. My part is resolved. If Peel oppose me, nay, even if he does not support me, I will surrender interest and ambition to the cause; I will persevere in it, God helping me, through storm and sunshine; I will commit all to Christ, and trusting in Him I shall never be confounded.'

Peel's attempts to muzzle the terrible philanthropist by the restraints of official position gave rise to the most amusing scenes of the struggle. When in 1839 he was endeavouring to form his 'three-days' Ministry,' which broke down on the famous Bed-chamber question, he earnestly pressed Lord Ashley, with many apologies, to condescend to accept a subordinate post in the Royal household, on the pretext of the immense service which his high character in the country would render to the Queen. 'I am,' he said, 'to provide the attendants and companions of this young woman, on whose moral and religious character depends the welfare of millions of human beings. Now will you assist me? Your character is such that you can do more than any man. I am *ashamed*,' he added with emphasis, 'to ask such a thing of you.' 'I was thunderstruck,' records Lord Ashley, on whose mind rushed all at once the surrender which the post entailed of all his cherished aims, and the humiliation of being reduced to play the insignificant part of a mere puppet. Nevertheless, for Peel's sake, in whom his faith was still unshaken, he swallowed the indignity, and exclaimed that, if he could be of use, he would accept the office of Chief Scullion! 'Peel,' he says, 'almost burst into tears, so intense did he profess his relief from anxiety to be.' Again, in 1841, when the same statesman returned to power, the like tactics were repeated, and office in the Royal household was pressed with singular importunity. This time Lord Ashley, knowing his man better, resolutely refused, and in his diary he expresses his indignant scorn, that Peel should have tried to thrust him into a position in which he could exhibit nothing but his legs in white tights, and do nothing but order dinners and carry about a white wand! Once again during the conflict, and almost on the eve of victory, negotiations were set on foot to induce him to enter the Ministry, but with the like result. 'The factory question'—so was his answer—'stood in the way.'

It may be that Lord Ashley failed to do entire justice to Peel's motives; but to the end of his days he remained convinced that the real object of all these overtures was to muzzle him. Many years afterwards, in some remarks written on a fly-leaf in Grant's 'History of Factory Legislation,' he gave his mature view of the matter in the following words:—

'Perhaps the various efforts made by Sir R. Peel to induce me to take office were among the greatest of my difficulties. The attractions of office were not weighty; but Sir R. Peel, wishing not so much to have me as a member of his Government, as to withdraw me from the Factory Bill, spared no entreaties, no "flatteries," no almost falsehoods, to entice me. He shifted his ground in every way, first one thing, then another. Among other things, the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland, as "a man who would have great influence over the clergy to induce them to accept reforms."'

It may be added here, that the Lord Shaftesbury of later years acted on the same principle when, in 1866, Lord Derby offered him a seat in the Cabinet. There remained yet, he said, 1,400,000 women, children, and young persons to be brought under the protection of the Factory Acts, and till that was done he could not allow himself to be withdrawn from the great work of his life. It is true that ten years before this he had, after an almost heroic resistance, yielded to accept office in the Palmerston Ministry, and escaped only by the skin of his teeth. 'I was at my wit's end,' he records; 'on one side was ranged wife, relations, friends, ambition, influence; on the other, my own objections. I could not satisfy myself that to accept office was a Divine call; I *was* satisfied that God had called me to labour among the poor. But God interposed for me.' Long afterwards he told the curious story of his escape. Things had gone so far, that he was actually dressed in his uniform, and waiting for the carriage to take him to the Palace to be sworn in:—

"While I was waiting for the carriage," he says, "I went down on my knees and prayed for counsel, wisdom, and understanding. Then there was some one at the door, as I thought, to say that the carriage was ready. Instead of that, a note, hurriedly written in pencil, was put into my hand. It was from Palmerston:—'Don't go to the Palace.' That was thirty years ago, but I dance with joy at the remembrance of that interposition, as I did when it happened. It was, to my mind, as distinctly an act of special Providence as when the hand of Abraham was stayed and Isaac escaped."

The 'ram caught in the thicket,' and substituted for the intended victim, was, as the biographer remarks, the Earl of Harrowby,

Harrowby, who was shortly afterwards sworn in as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

We must, however, return from this digression to the great and prolonged struggle over the charter of the factory hands, the Ten Hours' Bill. In carrying it on, Lord Ashley was as thorough in action, as we have seen him to be in resolve. He was not content to receive reports from others of the facts on which his Parliamentary agitation was based. To see everything for himself was his invariable rule, cost what it might, whether of time, labour, or money, of heart-ease or of bodily health. Southey, for whom he entertained a lively admiration, had early counselled him to abstain from making himself an eye-witness of the horrors he was striving to abate, warning him that the distressful recollections would be *burnt in* upon his soul, to the injury of his health and mental activity; but the advice had no effect. Many were the journeys which Lord Ashley made to Lancashire and Yorkshire, during which he personally examined the mills, the machinery, the dwellings of the operatives, and saw the workers and their work in every aspect and particular. It was this first-hand knowledge that enabled him to present his case in Parliament with an authority and a vividness which compelled attention, and sometimes almost electrified the House. Besides, to judge fairly of the immense sacrifices which this thoroughness entailed upon him, it must be remembered that during the fourteen years' struggle for the Ten Hours Bill, that was far from being the only battle which he fought in the interests of humanity. In fact, as soon as he stood out in the world's eyes as the champion of the oppressed factory hands, every other suffering class looked upon him as the Hercules who was to cleanse the Augean stable of its accumulated mass of pollution, and piteously invoked his aid. Of these superadded labours a few words may here be fitly interposed.

In 1840, he took up the cause of the infant chimney-sweeps, who, notwithstanding previous attempts to alleviate their terrible wrongs, were still being driven naked up the foul flues, where they were exposed to be scorched, roasted alive, or stifled, and from whence they often came down with bruised and excoriated bodies, to pass the hours of rest naked on the soot-heap, and contract tormenting skin-disease from the villainous stuff. Successful here, without delay he moved for an enquiry into the employment of women and children in mines and collieries, and in various trades which the Factory Acts did not touch; and when two years afterwards the first Report, dealing with mines and collieries, was presented, it
revealed

revealed such an unsuspected mass of cruelty, misery, and depravity, that the country stood aghast; and the Bill immediately introduced by Lord Ashley, closing all these subterranean workings against the labour of women and children, was borne forward on such a tide of public indignation, that it passed into law in a single Session, in spite of the coldness of the Government, the Peers, and even of the Church. Again, in 1845, when the second Report of the Commission was presented, he brought in and carried through Parliament a measure, founded upon it, to regulate the labour of children in calico print-works. 'Where will you stop?' demanded his interested opponents on this occasion. 'Nowhere!' was the characteristic answer, 'so long as any portion of this gigantic evil remains to be removed.' In addition to these enterprises of philanthropy, and some minor ones to which we have not space to allude, Lord Ashley was all this time busy, off and on, with advocating improvements in the laws regulating the care of lunatics. In one of his later reviews of his career he speaks of having spent 'seventeen years of labour and anxiety in obtaining the Lunacy Bill of 1845, and five years of increased labour since that time in carrying it into operation.' What we especially wish to point out is, that in all these enterprises he put into strenuous execution the resolve to see everything for himself. As he had inspected the factories and all the details of their industry, so he visited the print-works, went down into the mines and pits, saw the poor climbing-boys at their work, surveyed the lunatic asylums, and in every case, by frequent personal intercourse with the suffering and oppressed, made himself acquainted with their wrongs and their needs. Speaking especially of the operatives, he used to say, 'I sat and had tea and talk with them hundreds of times.'

After all his years of anxious and exhausting labour on the Ten Hours Bill, it was somewhat disappointing—or rather, it would have been so to any other man—that the actual passing of it in 1847 was left to other hands. When on Peel's conversion to free trade in corn Lord Ashley became convinced that the Repeal of the Corn Laws could no longer be resisted, his scrupulous conscience bade him resign his seat for Dorsetshire, rather than vote for the policy which he had been returned to oppose; and he declined to seek a re-election which would have been fought against by the county-purse, although some of his political friends offered him 2000*l.* towards the expenses. Two days before he applied for the Chiltern Hundreds, he re-introduced the Ten Hours Bill into Parliament, and then left it in the hands of his veteran supporter, Mr. Fielden. Through

the influence of the Government it was again thrown out, but by the narrow majority of 10; and at the beginning of the following Session, that of 1847, it was once more brought in, and this time with better prospects, since the Corn Law agitation no longer barred the way, and Lord J. Russell's Administration had become converts to the cause. During the preceding autumn and winter Lord Ashley had been working busily for it in the manufacturing districts, refusing all overtures from his friends to postpone the decisive battle till he could again lead them himself in the House of Commons; and when the critical moment arrived, he lingered about the lobbies, consumed by intense anxiety, and dreamed night and day about the Bill, as if he were still in charge of it. The opposition had not ceased to be bitter, but this time it was overborne by the roused and impatient feeling of the country. The Bill passed the second reading by a majority of 108, and the third by a majority of 63. In the Lords, where, better late than never, the Bishops mustered strongly in support, it passed through the second reading by 52 to 11, and on June 1st it got through the final stage without further division. What Lord Ashley's feelings were on this tardy but decisive triumph may be read in his own diary:—

'June 1, six o'clock.—News that the Factory Bill has just passed the third reading. I am humbled that my heart is not bursting with thankfulness to Almighty God—that I can find breath and sense to express my joy. What reward shall we give unto the Lord for all the benefits He hath conferred upon us? God, in His mercy, prosper the work, and grant that these operatives may receive the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord! Praised be the Lord, praised be the Lord, in Christ Jesus!'

So ended the fourteen years' battle on behalf of the poor women and children who had been ground down in the slavery of the cotton-mills. Yet there was still something to be done, to guard the protection which had been thus hardly won; and Lord Ashley, having been in the meantime returned for Bath, to the discomfiture of his bitter opponent, Mr. Roebuck, was able in his own person to head the last fight for humanity. It was still legal to run the mills for fifteen hours a day, i.e. from 5.30 A.M. to 8.30 P.M., and it became the practice of the owners to divide their female and young hands into relays and shifts, so as to keep the machinery going the whole of the time. The result was that the limitation of the protected labour to ten hours daily was evaded in reality, without any literal infringement of the law which could be easily detected; for the hands were detained in the works the whole fifteen hours at a stretch,

so as to be always ready to take up their turns, and it became impossible for the inspectors to discover and convict of a serious imposition of overtime. The legality of the system of shifts was tested in the Law Courts, but in vain; it was upheld, and fresh legislation was the only alternative. Accordingly, in 1850, Lord Ashley introduced a new Bill to meet the emergency, and, after several attempts at a compromise, the settlement was reached that the labour of the women and children should be confined between 6 A.M. and 6 P.M., with an hour and a half for meals (*i.e.* ten and a half hours of labour daily), with the exception of Saturdays, on which no protected person should be allowed to work after 2 P.M. Thus the result was a Ten Hours and a Half Law, with the modification of a half-holiday on Saturday; and such it remained till 1878, when a genuine Ten Hours Law was finally enacted.

We pass on now to the time when Lord Ashley's active life in the Commons was brought to a close by his father's death. This event occurred in June 1851, when the son had just turned the age of fifty; and, contrary to the usual course of things, his elevation to the Upper House was extremely unwelcome to him. Some time previously he had even made up his mind that he would not take his seat among the Peers. 'The leading of Providence,' he said, 'was the other way.' To a man of his warm and impetuous feelings on the subjects nearest to his heart the atmosphere of the Lords was altogether disagreeable. In his splenetic moods he called the august assembly a statue-gallery, a dormitory, a Nova Zembla, a vast aquarium full of cold-blooded life; 'it had no sympathies to be stirred;' 'character had no weight in it.' 'Philanthropy,' he wrote, 'combined with a peerage, reduces a man to the lowest point.' Of course he could not persevere in this resolve. The remonstrances of his friends, the calls for fresh legislation in the ever pressing cause of humanity, and his own irrepressible interest in public affairs, alike forbade so unreasonable and useless a retirement. But it is clear that, from this time, a change passed over his life. He laboured as diligently as ever for his favourite objects, but without the same eager spirit and pugnacious enthusiasm. Feelings of isolation, of weariness, grew upon him. His previous exertions had told on his constitution; his private circumstances harassed and depressed him; his views about the Church and the world became desponding and pessimistic. On the whole, the latter part of his life is less interesting than the earlier; the heroic stage of conflict had passed away; the narrowness of his religious conceptions came out into greater prominence, and occasionally imparted to his public

public conduct, and to his dealings with men as earnest for religion as himself, an unpleasant taint of factiousness and even of insolence. Of these remarks the justification will appear in our notices of the remaining thirty-four years of his prolonged career; but we hasten to add, that while in our critical estimate of his life and character we feel bound to recognize in him some of those errors, those blemishes, which are incident to human infirmity, the nobility of his nature remained unimpaired, and he still stood grandly before the world as one whose life was animated by the highest religious principle, and was laid as a whole burnt sacrifice upon the altar of God.

It was an interesting public tribute that was paid to him, when, in moving the writ for Bath to fill the vacancy left by his accession to the peerage, Sir Robert Inglis said that Lord Ashley's life had been consecrated, in accordance with the memorable inscription of the great Haller, '*Christo in pauperibus*'—to Christ in His poor. Repeated were the proofs given in after years that this consecration had not worn out. The very day after he took his seat, he moved the second reading of a Bill for the Inspection and Registration of Lodging Houses; a measure which speedily passed into law, and proved so successful in abating the monstrous evils arising from the crowding of the poorest and most helpless, amidst filth and stench, as thick as men, women, and children could be huddled together, in unventilated rooms, that it elicited from Charles Dickens the praise of being the best Act ever passed by an English Legislature. In the same year Lord Shaftesbury renewed his championship of the little chimney-sweeps, and from time to time he pleaded their cause down to 1875, when, after a whole century of enquiry, debate, and legislation, the emancipation of these most oppressed and tortured of all children on the face of the earth was finally achieved. Two years later, Lord Shaftesbury took in hand a Bill to provide accommodation for the poor who were turned out of their homes by the operations of 'Improvement Companies'; and at the same time he procured further legislation to bring common lodging-houses under more thorough inspection and control, so as in a measure to purify that Inferno in which nine-tenths of the crimes perpetrated in the metropolis were planned and plotted. And, as if this was not sufficient for one Session, he initiated at the same period his assault on juvenile mendicancy and crime, by a speech which had the curious result of bringing him a challenge to fight a duel from the Earl of Mornington, on the ground that in illustrating his argument he had quoted a judgment of Lord Eldon's, depriving that nobleman of the care of his own children

children. The answer was characteristic. 'Your lordship is good enough to send me what is technically called "a challenge." I refer you for a reply to this and any future communication, either to the police magistrate in Bow Street, or to my solicitors. Your obedient servant.' The following year saw him occupied with carrying a 'Youthful Offenders Bill,' to enable young criminals to be sent to Reformatory Schools for a term of training, instead of being confined for years in the corrupting air of a jail; a year later, we find the wrongs of the milliners and dressmakers occupying his attention.

These brief notes of Lord Shaftesbury's philanthropical labours in the Upper House of Parliament show how near to his heart the cause of the poor continued to lie; yet they exhibit but a portion of his work. For during all this time he was greatly occupied with sanitary matters. Since 1848 he had been chairman of the Board of Health; and of the toil and anxiety which were entailed upon him by this office, both during the cholera time, and subsequently in relation to measures for procuring a better water-supply, legislating for extra-mural interment, enforcing vaccination and smoke-abatement, and such like sanitary improvements, an idea may be formed from the following entry in his diary:—

'1851. Jan. 31.—The labours and anxieties of the Board of Health have, I suspect, contributed not a little to my disorders. I feel these subjects deeply; they are intimately connected with the physical and, to no small extent, with the moral welfare of mankind. I am grieved, harassed, overwhelmed with variety of work, a dull position, and a dismal horizon. I want neither honour, nor praise, nor payment; but I want some little fruit of protracted toil and expended health.'

The summer of 1854 dried up this source of anxiety and toil by bringing about the abolition of the old Board, and Lord Shaftesbury's consequent retirement. His feelings on the occasion were unusually bitter; he was evidently deeply hurt, somewhat more so, it seems to us, than was reasonable. 'Five years,' he exclaimed, 'have I given of my life and intense labour, and have not received even the wages of a pointer—"that's a good dog!"' Again: 'This public service is a hard, ungrateful thing. My remuneration has been that usually allotted to monkeys, more kicks than halfpence.' Then, again: 'Thus after five years of intense and unrewarded labour, I am turned off like a piece of lumber.' Once more: 'Thus have closed six years of very hard and gratuitous service. I may say, with old George III., on the admission of American Independence: "It may possibly turn out well for the country, but as a gentleman I can never forget it!"'

It

It is but fair to remark, that the irritability and peevishness, perceptible in the foregoing entries, were undoubtedly in great measure due to the unceasing strain and worry arising from pecuniary embarrassments. His succession to the family estates brought no relief to his previous difficulties, but rather aggravated them. On looking into his affairs he found enough to fill him with dismay. Debts, mortgages, mismanaged estates, neglected cottages, the mansion going to ruin, besides all his old arrears to be made good! Here is one of the entries, written on his first visit, as owner, to his ancestral home:—

‘Inspected a few cottages—filthy, close, indecent, unwholesome. But what can I do? I am half pauperized; the debts are endless; no money payable for a whole year, and I am not a young man. Every sixpence I expend—and spend I must on many things—is borrowed!’

Undaunted, however, at the gloomy prospect, he made up his mind that, as far as it could be prevented by any personal sacrifice, no one should be able to reproach the keeper of others’ vineyards with having neglected his own. To this effect the entries follow in rapid succession. ‘Shocking state of cottages—must build others, cost what it may.’ ‘Found a Scripture reader for the forests and steppes of Woodlands and Horton.’ ‘No school of any kind at Pentridge. Determined, under God, to build one, and may He prosper the work!’ ‘Oh, if instead of one hundred thousand pounds to pay in debt, I had that sum to expend, what good I might do!’ ‘There are things here to make one’s flesh creep, and I have not a farthing to set them right.’ It soon became evident that he could not afford to occupy St. Giles’s, and after a few months we find this entry:—

‘This day I prepare to leave “the Saint” for a long time, perhaps for ever! The issue is the Lord’s; “let Him do,” so said old Eli, “as it seemeth Him good!” I do love and cherish the spot, and pray that God will lift up the light of His countenance upon it, and all its people!’

But dismal entries soon occur again. ‘Made up my mind; must sell old family pictures, must sell old family estates.’ ‘Sent to St. Giles’s for two more pictures to be sold. The house is falling, and must be repaired; will not do it from any fund or revenue by which monies devoted to religion, charity, or cottage building would be diverted.’ He had already entirely restored his old parish church, ill as he could afford it, having declined to spend a penny on his own house till the village House of God was rescued from its shameful decay. But the pressure continued, even grew worse; and ten years later we come

across

across such entries as these :—‘Deep, bitter, exhausting, have been my efforts and anxieties for some time past.’ ‘Matters were at the worst, when Palmerston, whose liberality and kindness are not only *excessive*, but invariable, sent to Minny yesterday 5000*l.*, stating that he must be allowed to pay his half of her son’s start in the world.’ So short of money was he at times, and yet so moved by the appeals for charity, that he had been known to give away his last 5*l.* note to relieve an affecting case of distress. Much allowance, surely, ought to be made for occasional irritability in one whose naturally proud and independent spirit was fretted and depressed by such wearing cares. They lasted far into his old age ; but we may dismiss the subject here, with his biographer’s remark, that ‘for many years he was to have trouble and anxiety without ceasing—law suits without number, and vexations endless. It was a bitter ingredient in his cup, that, as the years advanced, the effort to keep free from debt became more and more difficult.’

No account of Lord Shaftesbury’s philanthropical labours would be even tolerably complete, which omitted to notice his Ragged-School work and his amusing intercourse with the London costermongers. He was not the inventor of the Ragged School, but from its first start he made the scheme peculiarly his own. It was in 1843, that by chance he came across an advertisement headed ‘Ragged Schools,’ being an appeal on behalf of an experimental school which had been opened for gutter children in an unsavoury spot known municipally as Field Lane, but popularly styled ‘Jack Ketch’s Warren,’ from the largeness of its annual contribution to the gallows. The rickety institution described was exactly what Lord Shaftesbury had been looking and hoping for, and he threw himself at once into the effort to multiply such schools, and bind them together into corporate union. This enterprise led him into the heart of the vilest rookeries, to find places where such schools might be opened, and to hunt up the young arabs of the gutter to fill them ; and often might he be seen sitting amidst the tattered outcasts, speaking to them kindly words of admonition and encouragement. Strange indeed were the scenes witnessed at the opening of these queer seats of culture ; as a specimen, we have one painted from the life by Dickens :—

‘A low-roofed den, in a sickening atmosphere, in the midst of taint and dirt and pestilence ; with all the deadly sins let loose, howling and shrieking at the doors. Zeal did not supply the place of method and training ; the teachers knew little of their office ; the pupils with an evil sharpness found them out, got the better of them, derided them,

them, made blasphemous answers to Scriptural questions, sang, fought, danced, robbed each other—seemed possessed by legions of devils. The place was stormed and carried over and over again; the lights were blown out, the books strewed in the gutters, and the female scholars carried off triumphantly to their old wickedness. With no strength in it but its purpose, the school stood it all out, and made its way.'

The Ragged-School movement, being what is called undenominational, brought Lord Shaftesbury into intimate connection with the evangelists and philanthropists of Nonconformity. Of this he speaks in his diary apologetically, but with firm conviction of its propriety. Thus on one occasion he writes:—

'Many Dissenters, but it is high time to be thinking where we agree, not where we differ. . . . I conceive I am acting in the spirit of the Bible and the spirit of the Church of England. I conceive that I am proving myself a true son of the Church in which I was baptized, and in which, by God's blessing, I will die. I am violating none of her laws, precepts, principles, or prayers; none. But if the conduct I pursue be at variance with the doctrines and requirements of the Established Church, I shall prefer to renounce communion with the Church to abandoning those wretched infants of oppression, infidelity, and crime. . . . Bishop of Norwich came. . . . Strange as it was to see a Bishop in the middle of a Dissenting school, surrounded by Dissenters, and supporting their efforts, yet it was well and usefully done.'

The toil which the success of the movement entailed on Lord Shaftesbury grew to extraordinary proportions. When there were more than a hundred schools affiliated to the Union, and each on its show-day claimed his presence to preside, speechify, and distribute prizes, it may be imagined how great was the addition made to the demands on his strength. It was characteristic of his unflinching pursuit of his object, that he always insisted on keeping these schools down to the level of the mire and gutter, so long as the mire and gutter existed. 'I feel,' he used to say, 'that my business lies in the gutter, and I have not the least intention to get out of it.' We need the less, however, to linger on this branch of his work, inasmuch as it has been already graphically described in an article from his own pen in this Review written forty years ago.* We will only add, that one of the most splendid and touching of unthought ovations, ever bestowed on a public benefactor, was that which was given him on his eightieth birthday in his character of President of the Ragged School Union.

The interest taken by Lord Shaftesbury in this peculiar

* See 'QUARTERLY REVIEW,' vol. 79, pp. 127 and following.

class of schools soon brought him into acquaintance with the London costermongers, whose families furnished the largest portion of the scholars. Johnson's definition of a costermonger, it seems, as 'a person who sells apples,' is pronounced 'gammon' by the fraternity, one of whom is said to have substituted the following for it: 'a cove wot works werry 'ard for a werry poor livin', and is always a-bein' hinterfered with, and blowed up, and moved hon, and fined, and sent to quod by the beaks and bobbies.' Among this curious tribe a mission had been set on foot by a zealous evangelist, and Lord Shaftesbury on hearing of it offered his services and became its President. Of the 'Barrow and Donkey Club,' which had been instituted, he enrolled himself a member, and subscribed for a barrow of his own, which bore his arms and motto, and was lent out to young members who had not yet attained to the honours of proprietorship. It was his delight to call himself a coster, and spend a social evening with the 'brethren.' On one such occasion, having invited them to write to him if any grievance sprang up, and being asked his address, he assured them that any letter sent to Grosvenor Square, with 'K.G. and Coster' after his name, would be sure to reach him. One anecdote of this queer intimacy is too amusing to be passed over. In 1875, the venerable Earl, being invited to meet them to receive a presentation, found above a thousand of the fraternity assembled with many friends of all classes; and presently, after taking his seat, a fine donkey decorated with ribbons was introduced, led up to the platform, and solemnly presented to his Lordship. The Earl, having vacated the chair in the donkey's favour, stood with his arm round its neck, while he briefly returned thanks, adding with a touch of pathos, 'When I have passed away from this life I desire to have no more said of me than that I have done my duty, as the poor donkey has done his, with patience and uncomplaining resignation.' On the retirement of the temporary *chair-man*, if the expression may be pardoned, the Earl begged the reporters to state that 'the donkey having vacated the chair, the place was taken by Lord Shaftesbury.'

We have now to deal with another and very important department of Lord Shaftesbury's life—his action in matters of religion. For forty years he was regarded as the lay-leader of the Low Church party, and was engaged in almost unceasing warfare against both the High and the Broad sections of the Church. It was his habit, as every one knows, to use extremely strong language in denouncing those with whom he disagreed; but as the proverb says, 'His bark was worse than his bite.'

This

This intemperance of speech was closely connected with that transparent simplicity of mind to which we have called attention; add to that vehemence of emotion, and the phenomenon is explained. He could see but a single side of anything; no questions, no characters, were complex to him; deep black and spotless white were his only shades. Whatever at the first blush seemed to him objectionable—in other words, out of harmony with his stereotyped views—must be nothing less than ‘earthly, sensual, devilish;’ and the most scathing and vituperative epithets that rose to his ready lips must forthwith be flung at it. Nor was this habit confined to matters of religion. In his diary we find it affecting his political entries. Not that he was much of a politician in the ordinary sense; his politics were subordinated to his philanthropical and religious views; and statesmen seemed to him in the main good or bad, as they helped or hindered his cherished aims. Strange as it may appear, the only leading politician for half a century, who escaped the rough side of his pen or tongue, was the easy-going man of the world, Lord Palmerston. Family ties may have had something to do with this, but not much. For his wife’s step-father Lord Shaftesbury felt a genuine, even an enthusiastic, admiration and love. Nowhere does this come out more clearly than in the entries in the diary made during that statesman’s last illness, and just after his death; such, for instance, as these: ‘O God, spare him.’ ‘P. is better, God be blessed.’ ‘Unloose the peg, and all will be adrift; Palmerston is that peg.’ ‘In fearful anxiety about Palmerston; he is the only true Englishman left in public life.’ ‘There goes the *ultimus Romanorum*. What an instrument he has been in the hands of the Almighty.’ ‘Palmerston was the grand pillar appointed, under God’s Providence, to which all the vessels of the State were linked, and so the fleet was held to its moorings. It is now cast down; the ships are set afloat without rudder or compass, and will drift in every direction over the broad sea.’ And the whole lament is concentrated in the following outburst:—

‘Ah, but to none will the loss be as it is to myself. I lose a man who, I knew, esteemed and loved me far beyond every other man living. He showed it in every action of his heart, in every expression of his lips, in private and in public as a man, as a relative, and as a Minister. His society was infinitely agreeable to me; and I admired, every day more, his patriotism, his simplicity of purpose, his indefatigable spirit of labour, his unfailing good humour, his kindness of heart, and his prompt, tender, and active considerateness for others, in the midst of his heaviest toils and anxieties.’

With

With this solitary exception, all the leaders came under the sharp stroke of Lord Shaftesbury's pen. A few specimens of his judgments upon them may be quoted, not because they are of any particular value in themselves, but for the light thrown by them on the worth of those violent utterances, which he used to blurt out against persons whose theological opinions differed from his own. We take Sir Robert Peel first, the leader of his own side in politics, under whom he held office, and with the success of whose Administration in 1839, he 'thought the interests, temporal and eternal, of millions were wrapped up.' Two years after that we find him analysing Peel's character in antithetical sentences: 'He has abundance of human honesty, and not much of Divine faith; he will never do a dishonourable thing, he will be ashamed of doing a religious one; he will tolerate no jobs to win votes, he will submit to no obloquy to please God.' By the next year the pen has grown sharper: 'All Peel's affinities are towards wealth and capital. What has he ever done or proposed for the working classes? Cotton is everything, man is nothing!' A year more, and the tone is bitterer still, provoked by Peel's speech on the opium trade: 'the tone of a low, mercantile, financial soul, incapable of perceiving or urging a principle, which finally disgusted me, and placed him in my mind much below the Christian level, and not any higher than the heathen.' Even this scarcely prepares us for the entry three months later: 'I have thought for some years that Peel and John Russell are the most criminal of mankind!' It is a relief to meet the somewhat more kindly expression of feeling, however brief, which Peel's tragic death evoked: 'In many respects one of the greatest men of this generation. He had wonderful qualities of various kinds, and his loss is great.'

Of Earl Russell the savage judgment just quoted, far from being modified, is confirmed twelve years later: 'Lord John going to the House of Lords. Why is the House of Lords to be made the London Reformatory, where convicted criminals are to have another chance? Is it good that so tarnished a man should be in so brilliant a situation? . . . No slight affront to public morality that Lord J. was ever summoned to construct an Administration.' Yet here too, in the presence of death, we find a tardy recantation in the following words: 'In his whole course to have done much with credit and nothing with dishonour, and so to have sustained and advanced his reputation to the very end, is a mighty commendation.' Of Peel's colleagues, Sir J. Graham comes in for a like scourging: 'Graham has contrived to render himself so thoroughly odious that I cannot

cannot find any one human being who will speak a word on his behalf. He is universally distrusted, and that by everyone, from a prince to a beggar.' Mr. Bright, who fought strenuously against the Ten Hours Bill as the advocate of the mill-owners, is touched off in such phrases as these: 'Most awfully reviled by Messrs. Bright, &c.'; 'Bright was ever my most malignant opponent.' Under date 1867, we find Lord Derby, Mr. Disraeli, and Mr. Gladstone, all tarred with the same free brush:—

'Gladstone is governed by the greed of place and salary and power. Disraeli is no better. Here are two tigers over a carcass, and each one tries to drive the other away from the tit-bits. . . . Derby told his friends that if they passed his Bill they would be in office for many years. Thus it is; all alike—all equally carnivorous. "Voilà ce que nous sommes"! as the chiffonier said over the dead cur.'

The scanty justice done by Lord Shaftesbury to the two great rivals for power, mentioned in the last extract, arose primarily from the prepossessions through which he viewed their conduct. The one he distrusted because of his rooted attachment to High Church principles; the other, because he could not recognize in him any principle at all. Of Mr. Gladstone we repeatedly come across notices of this kind: 'Gladstone is on a level with the rest; he gave no support to the Ten Hours Bill.' 'Palmerston must soon be removed, and his successor Gladstone will bring with him the Manchester school for colleagues and supporters, a hot Tractarian for Chancellor, and the Bishop of Oxford for an ecclesiastical adviser. *He will succumb to every pressure, except the pressure of a Constitutional and Conservative policy.*' Of Mr. Disraeli, on his becoming Premier, we find the following sketch:—

'Disraeli, Prime Minister! He is a Hebrew; this is a good thing. He is a man sprung from an inferior station; another good thing in these days, as showing the liberality of our institutions. "But he is a leper," without principle, without feeling, without regard to anything, human or divine, beyond his own ambition. He has dragged, and he will continue to drag, everything that is good, safe, venerable, and solid through the dust and dirt of his own objects.'

Shortly after we read: 'Dizzy is seeking everywhere for support. He is all things to all men, and nothing to any one. He cannot make up his mind whether to be Evangelical, Neologian, or Ritualistic; he is waiting for the highest bidder.' Then later: 'I admire the abilities of the man, but not his use of them. There is nothing really to admire in him, beyond the possession of talents.' Once more, after the return from Berlin

as bearer of 'Peace with honour,' we find this comment: 'The steps of this mighty man to glory and greatness are strides as rapid as they are broad. And yet I had rather, by far, be George Holland of Whitechapel, than Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield.'

With such sentiments about the rival leaders, it is no wonder that Lord Shaftesbury preferred to stand aloof from both. The impartiality of his aversion is exhibited in several passages of his letters and diaries—the last we shall quote in this connection. For instance, after reading in the papers at Homburg the debates in the summer of 1878, he writes to his eldest daughter, Lady Templemore:—

'The Liberal party is right in its views and opinions; the Conservatives the very reverse. Both are wrong in their motives; for neither cares a straw for anything but the triumph of their own side. . . . Much as I detest and fear the policy of the "Duke of Cyprus," I do not wish to cast in my lot with Gladstone and Company. Observe how judicious and charitable I am. I speak evil of neither faction. Both, I assert, are *equally good*.'

In the diary, towards the end of the same year, the same note is sounded: 'Which is the more objectionable, I cannot say. The Liberals are revolutionary, the Conservatives are servile. Neither has any principle or patriotism.' Presently after, he calls the Liberals 'a political body of men whom, in every possible sense of the word, I distrust, quite as much as I distrust Lord Beaconsfield and his followers.' And a little later, *à propos* of Irish land legislation, we read:—

'The policy of such men as Beaconsfield and Gladstone turns these movements, which should and which might be gradual, into sudden and violent Revolutions. The Act of 1867 tore up our political system, and Gladstone's rule, at the present day, is uprooting, and irrevocably, our social system.'

For our purpose the value of these judgments on contemporary politicians is purely psychological. They illustrate the action of Lord Shaftesbury's mind, and explain the vehemence of his language in other matters, especially in those which concern religion. For the same purpose we may add two casual instances of like hasty truculence of expression. Twice, when travelling abroad, he is reminded of Louis XIV., and immediately the 'grand monarque' is gibbeted in his journal; on one occasion as 'the most polished villain that ever possessed and prostituted the gifts of God;' on the other, as 'that arch-villain and exceeding charlatan.' He reads a life of Sir W. Raleigh, and straightway the British Solomon, James I., is labelled as 'that despicable

despicable reptile of the human race.' After all this, it would be absurd to take Lord Shaftesbury too seriously, when he denounces the Puseyites as the 'sons of Babylon,' for whom a new large ward must be built in Bedlam—calls the service at St. Alban's, Holborn, 'the worship of Jupiter and Juno,'—puts up the prayer, 'O Lord, purge the Church of those men who, while their hearts are in the Vatican, still eat the bread of the Establishment and undermine her'—tickets Ritualism as 'the abomination'—declares that he would vote for Sternhold and Hopkins, Tate or Brady, against the greatest geniuses in the art of verse if they happened to be Tractarians—and brings the house down by exclaiming that he would rather worship with Lydia on the bank by the river-side, than with a hundred surpliced priests in the temple of St. Barnabas. A similar abatement may be made from his anathemas against the Neologians, among whom he classed all the labourers in the field of Biblical criticism; as when he stigmatizes their religion as 'sensuous'—pronounces them 'ecclesiastical Judases, pretending belief in the Holy Scriptures, betraying the Son of Man with a kiss'—loathes Dr. Jowett's theology—characterizes 'Ecce Homo' as 'the most pestilential book ever vomited from the jaws of hell'—and even charges with indecency the application of the descriptive term 'rhetorical' to a passage in the Pentateuch. Nor is his own party in the Church less interested in discounting his scornful utterances. He is continually complaining of the 'Evangelical religionists,' whom he cannot rely upon, and will not attempt to lead—now utterly intolerant, and now so cold and insincere that Meroz would be a pattern to them of promptitude—so disunited that even Falstaff would not march through Coventry with such a regiment—so ill-affected to himself that in his old age he deliberately declared he had received treatment from them he had never received from any other party. 'High Churchmen,' he said, 'Roman Catholics, even infidels, have been friendly to me; my only enemies have been the Evangelicals.'

Of all this we do not desire to make too much; but it cannot be fairly passed over, because it entered very largely into the popular conception of the Earl in the latter part of his career, and exposed him at times to considerable obloquy. He was not the less in request as a noble figure-head to embellish a large number of the religious societies connected with the Evangelicals; and under the burden of the annual speeches, which he was always expected to deliver as president, he often groaned. 'Those terrible chairs!' he used to exclaim; 'my letters and chairs eat me up;' 'no end of chairs, speeches, and committees,

committees, I cannot number them; they are like the sands of the sea, and shall I call them equally incohesive and unprofitable?' But it did produce in him a feeling of isolation and loneliness, under which his spirits often failed, although he bore it with something of stoical pride. A few evidences of this we quote, to complete his portraiture, beginning with one written towards the end of 1868:—

'What is my position now? It is like an old tree in a forest, half-submerged by a mighty flood. I remain where I was, while everything is passing beyond me. New ideas, new thoughts, new views, and new feelings, are flowing rapidly by. I cannot go along with the stream, and if I survive, one of two issues awaits me; either I shall be overwhelmed, and so utterly lost; or the waters in their course will have rushed away and left me alone, stranded and leafless, a venerable proof of consistency, as some would say, but of bigotry in the estimation of others.'

Ten years later the tone deepens, and acquires almost the pathos of a wail. It was after his singularly ill-advised rupture with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and his failure to crush one of its books at which he took offence, that he wrote thus in his Diary:—

'Who is with me? Who? Positively I know not. Here and there an individual, perhaps; but nothing of note—nothing of moral courage among those who secretly believe (if there are any), has appeared on my side. According to all human estimate, all human judgment, all human calculation, I must be wrong. I must be wilful, self-sufficient, ignorant and stubborn. I should, I suspect, say it of another in a similar position—and why, then, not of myself? Simply because I cannot.'

Even more striking as a self-revelation is the letter which he wrote to the author of the incriminated book, and which was published at the time, but is not reproduced in the biography. It concludes as follows:—

'You have gained everything that you require. You have on your side an enormous proportion of the clergy, and no small number from among the laity and the Nonconformist ministers; you have, moreover, the approbation of the Primate of all England. With myself it is precisely the reverse. I lie under the condemnation of them all, from the Archbishop down to the smallest of the daily papers. You are content with the issue, and so am I. Six months more of writing could add nothing to the satisfaction we, each of us, enjoy.'

To this not a word needs to be added, except the pathetic entry in his Diary at the close of the same year:—'In religious matters I know but Reeve and Spurgeon, and they are seldom or never within reach. In politics not a soul.'

Here

Here we bring our sketch to an end. Of his famous attempt, as Lord Palmerston's bishop-maker, in conjunction with Mr. Haldane, the director of the 'Record' in those years, to right the balance of the Church, by packing the Episcopal Bench with pronounced Evangelicals, it need only be said that its simplicity was on a par with its undoubted honesty of purpose. Nor is there any occasion to tell again the story of his experiments in ecclesiastical legislation. They were forced upon him against his own judgment; and with his strong bias to one of the extremes in the Church, he was certainly not the person to conduct them to a successful issue. As a politician and a religious leader he had outlived his time, and was morbidly conscious of being a solitary survival in the midst of a new world of ideas and aims. But, as a philanthropist, his heart was green and vigorous to the last. No chills of age could lessen the passionate warmth of his pity for the poor and suffering; no invading feebleness of voice or limb hold him back from advocating the cause of the defenceless and oppressed. For these his zeal burnt with an unquenchable fire; for these he toiled as long as the faculty to do anything remained to him; for these he could have wished still to live and labour, even when the infirmities of fourscore-and-four years had made life a burden. 'I cannot bear,' he said in his last days, 'to leave the world with all the misery in it.' It is this unreserved, this absolute sacrifice of himself, body and soul, to the work of alleviating that misery, which encircles his name with a glory, in the brightness of which those petty peculiarities and narrownesses to which we have referred are swallowed up and disappear. His career is the national inheritance of the English-speaking race, as an immortal protest against a life of self-seeking, and a noble lesson how worldly rank and station may be redeemed from moral insignificance, and consecrated to the best interests of humanity. 'Love, Serve,' was his ancestral motto; to love and serve was the paramount, abiding law of his existence, till death gently brought him the rest which, living, he would never seek for himself.

- ART. II.—1. *The London University Calendar*, 1886-7.
 2. *Reports of the Association for promoting a Teaching University for London*.
 3. *Minutes of Convocation of the University of London*, 1885-6.
 4. *Report of International Conference on Education*, 1884. Vol. III. *University Education*. London, 1884.
 5. *L'Université de Londres*. Par M. Buisson ; Ancien élève de l'école normale supérieure. Paris, 1879.

FIFTY years ago, on the 28th of November, 1836, King William IV. granted 'to certain persons eminent in literature and science' a Royal Charter, empowering them, under the style and title of the University of London, to act as a Board of Examiners, and to confer degrees in all branches of learning except divinity. On the same day a charter was also granted to another institution, called the London University College, in Gower Street, incorporating it for the purpose of affording, at a moderate expense, the means of education in Literature, Science, and the Fine Arts, and in the knowledge requisite for admission to the learned professions, but giving to it no power to confer degrees.

The controversies and discussions, which resulted in this arrangement, had extended over the preceding eleven years. But the project of a third University in England, to fulfil some educational functions which could not well be discharged by the venerable foundations of Oxford and Cambridge, was not new in 1825. It had been entertained at intervals during the three previous centuries. In an Appendix to Stow's 'Annales' (1615) there is a curious treatise, purporting to describe the three famous Universities of England—Oxford, Cambridge, and London. The description of the third is contributed by Sir George Buck, who enumerates in succession the divinity schools at St. Paul's, at Westminster, and at St. Peter's in Cornhill; the King's College in Chelsea; the Inns of Court and of Chancery, then fourteen in number, each provided with its staff of readers and lecturers; Doctors' Commons, for the study and practice of the Civil Law; the College of Physicians; St. Katherine's College; the College of Heralds; and St. Paul's School, then recently founded by Dean Colet. He argues that all these, taken together, entitle the Metropolis to be called a great seat of learning, and a worthy resort of scholars, 'lacking nothing but a common government and the protection of an honourable Chancellor' to make it in name, what it already was in substance, a University of London. Especially

he calls attention to one of the latest additions to the intellectual resources of the metropolis, the noble foundation of Sir Thomas Gresham, who in 1548 had bestowed his large mansion and gardens in Bishopsgate Street as the residence for seven professors, and endowed it with revenues arising from the rents and profits of the new Royal Exchange, which he had founded for the use of the merchants of London. Although this design at first encountered strenuous opposition from the authorities of Oxford and Cambridge, on the ground that the establishment of a new University would injure those older foundations, Gresham was no innovator or educational reformer. He had been educated at Cambridge. The *trivium* and *quadrivium*, and the traditional discipline of the ancient Universities, were in his judgment the true foundations for the education of a merchant, as well as for that of a clergyman or a lawyer. It was with a view to place at the disposal of the citizens of London means of academic instruction, cheaper and more accessible than those of Cambridge and of Oxford, that he established Gresham College. He required that seven professors—of Divinity, Music, Astronomy, Geometry, Law, Physic, and Rhetoric—should dwell together in one community, and should lecture daily to all comers. For some unexplained reason, he confided the choice of the first four of these professors to the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London, and the last three to the Company of Mercers, and gave to both bodies a share in the administration of the funds. For a short time all went well; the lectures of the early professors, among whom were Barrow, Dr. John Ball, Hooke, Petty, and Sir Christopher Wren, appear to have been well attended, and to have possessed the same disciplinal character as that of the professors' lectures in the older Universities. Indeed Buck speaks admiringly of the new institution as in itself a minor University, '*Academiæ epitome*.' But litigation, negligence, disputes between the professors and the governing body respecting money and the conditions of residence, combined to weaken the institution. The great Fire of London for a time interrupted the work of the College, and destroyed the principal source of its revenues. The lectures, even when resumed, became fewer and intermittent, and in 1768 the last pretence of maintaining a corporate life disappeared, and the professors were compensated for the surrender of their residences by an additional stipend of 50*l.* a year. It is rather to the rigid and inelastic requirements of the original statutes, which remain to this day unrepealed, than to any failure of duty on the part of the City authorities, that the present condition of this noble foundation is to be ascribed. But the warmest

warmest admirers of Gresham College will hardly contend, that it has ever thoroughly fulfilled the intentions of its founder, or that it is now serving any very conspicuous or useful purpose as an instrument for satisfying the higher intellectual wants of the metropolis.

Had the dream of Bacon in the 'New Atlantis' ever been fulfilled, Solomon's House would have deserved the name of a great University, though of a new and unprecedented type. He too had been a scholar at Cambridge; but he was profoundly dissatisfied with the work which he had done there, notwithstanding the recent revival of learning and the impulse then given to liberal studies. In the 'De Augmentis' he sets forth at length the mistakes and shortcomings of the ancient Universities. They did, he thought, little or nothing for the enrichment of human life, and for the discovery of new truth. They were all dedicated too exclusively to the use of certain professions, conventionally called 'learned;' and were not free to encourage the teaching of arts and sciences at large. 'There is no collegiate institution for history, modern languages, politics, and the like means of qualifying such as are disposed for the service of the State.' Their cardinal defects were, in his view, their immobility, and the unwillingness of their governing bodies to adapt them to the changed circumstances and needs of successive generations. 'There is,' he said, 'a neglect in governors of Universities with regard to consultations; and in princes, of visitations; to observe with diligence whether the readings, exercises, and disputations, and other academical customs, anciently instituted, should be still continued, changed, or reformed.' And, by way of illustrating his own conception of what a great University might effect for the promotion of real knowledge, he sketches out in the 'New Atlantis,' under the guise of a philosophic community in an imaginary island, an institution 'the lanthorn of the kingdom, dedicated to the study of the works and creatures of God.' Solomon's House was to contain ample and elaborate provision for the trial of experiments on materials and forces, and for the collection of new information from foreign lands, high towers for astronomical observations, gardens, great lakes for the preservation of fish and birds, furnaces, perspective houses, sound-houses for experiments in hearing, perfume-houses, and engines; above all, a confederation of scholars and fellows, some to sail to foreign lands and bring home facts, others to collect and record the results of all investigations and observations as soon as they were made, and at the head of the whole hierarchy of teachers, enquirers, and inventors, three sages 'to raise the former

discoveries by experiments into greater observations, axioms, and aphorisms. These we call interpreters of nature.'

This fair and inspiring vision was destined to be realized, not in the form in which it shaped itself to Bacon's imagination, but in other ways which he could not forecast. The ends at which he aimed have indeed been attained, or are in process of attainment. But the means by which they have been wrought out—the apparatus and equipment we now use for the pursuit of science—do not possess the unity and symmetry of Solomon's House. 'God fulfils Himself in many ways,' and the work which Bacon desired to see effected by a single and highly organized corporation has been shared in later days by the Royal Society, by the British Association, by the Linnean, the Geological, and the other Societies now housed in the quadrangle of Burlington House; by the voyages of the 'Beagle,' the 'Fox,' and the 'Challenger;' by Eclipse expeditions; by the researches of Jenner and Harvey, of Boyle and Newton, of Watt and Wheatstone, of Faraday and Darwin.

When Cowley, two generations later, put forth his 'Proposition for the advancement of experimental philosophy,' his main design was substantially identical with that of Bacon, but he sought to reduce the somewhat airy speculations of the 'New Atlantis' to the form of a practicable project. He proposed the erection in London, or in its immediate neighbourhood, of a philosophical college, with 'a person of eminent quality, a lover of solid learning, and no stranger in it,' as chancellor or president; with twenty resident philosophers or professors, sixteen young scholars—servants to the professors, a chaplain, a manciple, a surgeon, a library-keeper, and other officers. There were to be three fair quadrangular courts near the river, with gardens, trees, and fountains; a large and pleasant dining-room, a picture gallery, an anatomy-chamber, a second garden destined only for the 'trial of all manner of experiments concerning plants, as their melioration, acceleration, retardation, conservation, composition, transmutation, coloration, or what ever else can be produced by art.' As to the professors, some were to go abroad at stated times 'to make observations of new discoveries, and of the state of learning in foreign countries. At their going abroad they shall take a solemn oath never to write anything to the College, but what after very diligent examination they shall fully believe to be true, and to confess and recant it as soon as they shall find themselves in error.' Due provision is made not only for regular prelections, at such times as shall be most convenient to auditors resident in London, but also for the common life and intercourse of the professors, for their daily supper together

together in the Hall, and for a 'dinner twice a week at two round tables, for the convenience of discourse, which shall be for the most part of such matters as may improve their studies.' With a view to keep the members of the community from falling into unprofitable talk on these occasions, it is further provided that two of the professors shall serve by turns as *arbitri mensarum*, and shall be empowered to command, if necessary, one of the servant-scholars to read to the company while at table. They are also to be at liberty to invite from time to time men of learning or great parts as stranger-guests; 'but very rarely, nothing being more vain and unfruitful than numerous meetings of acquaintances.' There are in Cowley's scheme other notable provisions, *e.g.* that if any one of the professors be the author of an invention that may bring in profit, one-third part of such profit shall belong to the inventor, and two-thirds to the Society; that each member of the fraternity shall give an account of the result of his general studies, and of any particular inquisition in which he may have been concerned, to the assembled professors; and that the College shall print once in three years a public account of its researches and doings, and of their fruits. The scheme proceeds to map out a course of reading, 'especially in those authors who treat some parts of nature, as Aristotle, Theophrastus, Varro, Pliny, Celsus, Virgil, and Cicero, for the infusing of knowledge and language at the same time, this being their apprenticeship in Natural Philosophy.' For the maintenance of this great Metropolitan University it was calculated that an annual subvention of 4000*l.* would suffice; since, in Cowley's view, gifts, fees, and endowments would surely be added, as the usefulness of the institution to the State, and especially to the inhabitants of London, came to be more and more appreciated. In particular he hoped, 'when it shall please God, either by their own industry and success, or by the benevolence of patrons, to enrich them so far as that it may come to their turn and duty to be charitable to others,' to obtain endowments providing for the admission of poor men's sons 'whose good and natural parts may promise either use or ornament to the commonwealth.' And with the fine and generous instinct which has happily been characteristic of the founders of so many of our English grammar schools, he requires the governors to take care that this shall be done 'with the same conveniences as are enjoyed by rich men's children, there being nothing of eminent and illustrious to be expected from a low, sordid, and hospital-like education.'

The aims of those who, in 1825, took the first steps towards the establishment of the present University of London were, in
some

some respects, less ambitious than those of Bacon or of Cowley. In the letter of Thomas Campbell to Mr. Brougham, in which the general plan of the new institution was sketched out, and public sympathy invoked in its behalf, the author of the 'Pleasures of Hope' expressly disavowed any intention of asking for power to confer degrees, and declined to rest his case on any allegation of abuse in existing Universities. The two venerable abodes of learning are, he says, practically inaccessible to the youth of the middle classes in London, partly because of the distance, and partly because of the expense of residence :

'The plan which I suggest is a great London University . . . for effectively and multifariously teaching, examining, exercising, and rewarding with honours, in the liberal arts and sciences, the youth of our middling rich people, between the ages of 16 and 20, or later if you please . . . an establishment availing itself of all the experience and experiments that can be appealed to for facilitating the art of teaching, a university combining the advantages of public and private education, the emulative spirit produced by examination before numbers, and by honours conferred before the public, the cheapness of domestic residence and all the moral influence that results from home.'

The scheme thus foreshadowed evoked considerable public interest and discussion. Shares representing the sum of 160,000*l.* were speedily taken up, a site was secured, and on the 30th of April, 1827, the foundation-stone of the building in Gower Street was laid by the Duke of Sussex. Professors were soon appointed, and in the following year classes were opened in the three Faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine, and 557 students were entered. The promoters of the undertaking sought to obtain for the new institution the status and privileges of a University, and made more than one unsuccessful effort to obtain from the Crown a Charter of incorporation empowering it to confer degrees. Meanwhile the building in Gower Street was provisionally called the 'London University,' a title which, though never legally conferred on it, and though distinctly renounced by its own proprietors in 1836, has still survived in popular parlance, and to this hour helps to keep alive among the uninstructed a confusion between University College and the University, the larger cosmopolitan body, of which, subsequently, the College formed the principal constituent part.

From the first, the founders of the College expressly stipulated that no student should be called upon to subscribe any form of religious test, or be excluded on the ground of theological belief. Hence it was distinctly stated in all the applications to the Government for a Charter, that no power to
grant

grant degrees in Divinity would be sought or accepted by the governors. Counter-petitions and remonstrances, however, were not wanting. The College of Surgeons and the medical schools of London objected to the establishment of a new rival school which should have the power to grant degrees in medicine or surgery. The petition of Oxford set forth that

‘serious injury would accrue to numerous ancient institutions, and much consequent evil to the public, if a right to confer any academical distinctions, designated by the same title or accompanied with the same privileges as the degrees of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge, should be given by Royal Charter to a society which had no immediate connection with the Established Church, and taught no system of religion.’

The state of public opinion which followed the Reform Bill, however, encouraged the promoters to continue their efforts, and the rejection by the House of Lords in 1834 of the Bill which had passed the Commons, for the admission of Dissenters to degrees in Oxford and Cambridge, gave to the friends of the enterprise a new argument in support of their claim. In March 1835 an address to the Crown was, on the motion of Mr. Tooke, carried by a majority of 110 in the House of Commons, praying that a Charter might be granted to the new institution, entitling it to grant degrees in all departments of learning except Theology and Medicine; and the prayer of this address was referred for consideration to the Privy Council. Meanwhile another institution, called King’s College, had been founded by leading members of the Church of England, having the same general educational objects as University College, but differing only in so far as it provided for its students religious instruction and worship in accordance with the principles of the Established Church. Having regard to the interests of this and other metropolitan institutions, the Privy Council recommended, and the Government concurred in the recommendation, that a compromise should be effected. The Home Secretary, Mr. Spring Rice, afterwards Lord Monteagle, announced the willingness of the Government to issue two charters; the one to the London University College, recognizing it as a place of academic education; the other, constituting a new body under the name of the University of London, with power to confer academical distinctions, not only on the students who might be educated at University or King’s College, but also upon those of any institution in the Metropolis or elsewhere, which might from time to time, with the consent of the Secretary of State, be added to the list of affiliated Colleges.

It is to the credit of the promoters of University College
that

that they accepted this arrangement cordially and gratefully, although it gave them far less than they had at first demanded, and although such acceptance involved the renunciation of all claim to exercise the full functions of a University, and placed them on a footing of equality with some younger and less important institutions. The new constitution was speedily completed. The Earl of Burlington, now the Duke of Devonshire, became the first Chancellor, and Mr. John Lubbock, the father of the present Sir John Lubbock, the first Vice-Chancellor. Among the earliest members of the Senate were the Bishops of Norwich and Chichester, and Dr. Arnold of Rugby. It appears to have been the design of the Government of the day to obtain the co-operation of distinguished scholars of various creeds, and particularly to avoid identifying the new institution with the sectional interests of Nonconformists, or with any hostility to the Established Church.

In the light of subsequent events, it is especially interesting to recal the share which Dr. Arnold took in the first councils of the University, and the views and hopes which he entertained in connection with it. He was at that moment in fierce revolt against the new school of theology at Oxford; and to him some of the enterprises of the active and aggressive party, of which Brougham was the most conspicuous representative—the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, the Penny Magazine, the British and Foreign School Society, and the new University of London—seemed full of promise for the intellectual emancipation and improvement of the whole English people. But he had grave misgivings as to the moral influence likely to be exerted by all these agencies, if unguarded and unregulated by religious principle. The arid and limited conception of ‘Useful Knowledge’ which dominated the publications of the Society, and the indifference to religion which pervaded them, chilled and disheartened him. In his view, the education of an Englishman need not indeed be exclusive or sectarian, but should be essentially Christian. ‘The slightest touch of Christian principle and Christian hope in the Society’s biographical and historical articles,’ he said in one of his letters, ‘would be a sort of living salt to the whole.’ And in another letter he described the sort of literature which he should like to furnish to the working-men of England, as ‘Cobbett-like in style but Christian in spirit. . . . I never wanted articles on religious subjects half so much as articles on common subjects written with a decidedly Christian tone.’ And his enthusiasm in favour of directing these new and hopeful agencies for mental improvement into a course which should be favourable to the higher
and

and spiritual interests of the nation took a very practical and characteristic form, when, in writing to one of the officers of the Diffusion Society, he said :—

‘I am convinced that if the “Penny Magazine” were decidedly and avowedly Christian, many of the clergy throughout the kingdom would be most delighted to assist its circulation by every means in their power. For myself I should think that I could not do too much to contribute to the support of what would then be so great a national blessing, and I should beg to be allowed to offer £50 annually towards it, so long as my remaining in my present situation enabled me to gratify my inclinations to that extent.’

The same feeling which prompted this generous offer caused Arnold to urge upon his colleagues, the first Fellows of the new University, that an acquaintance with some part of the New Testament in the original, and with Scripture history, ought to be required of every candidate for a degree in Arts. For degrees in Law or Medicine he was not disposed to insist on this condition. But a degree in Arts, he contended, ought to certify that the holder had received a complete and liberal education, and a liberal education without the Scriptures must in any Christian country be a contradiction in terms. Of theoretic difficulties about the conduct of the examination, he made very light :

‘I am perfectly ready,’ he said, ‘to examine to-morrow in any Unitarian School in England in presence of parents and masters. I will not put a question that shall offend, and yet I will give such an examination as will bring out or prove the absence of Christian knowledge of the highest value. I speak as one who has been used to examine young men in the Scriptures for nearly twenty years; and I pledge myself to the perfect easiness of doing this. Our examinations, in fact, will carry their own security with them, if our characters will not, and we should not and could not venture to proselytize even if we wished it. But the very circumstance of our having joined the London University at the risk of much odium from a large part of our profession would be a warrant for our entering into the spirit of the Charter with perfect sincerity.’

These views, however, were not accepted by the majority of his colleagues, many of whom saw, with greater clearness than he, how difficult it would be to secure a succession of Arnolds as Scripture examiners; and how many promising and honourable students might possibly be excluded from the University, if the religious examination were insisted on. Accordingly, his proposal, that every candidate for the degree of B.A. should be required to take up one of the Gospels or Epistles at his discretion, was rejected. But in deference to the views of those
who

who sympathized with him, a voluntary or supplementary examination was instituted in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the Greek text of the New Testament, and in Scripture History and Evidences; and special certificates and prizes were offered to those who succeeded in this examination. Though keenly regretting that the principle for which he had contended was thus practically rejected, Arnold yet remained in the Senate for a time, partly because he did not wish, as a private clergyman, to censure, even by implication, those Bishops and clergy who still felt it their duty to remain; and partly in the hope of making the Scriptural examination as attractive and efficient as possible, and perhaps of so regulating its conditions that the Arts degree would be generally understood to be incomplete without it. When it afterwards became evident, that neither the authorities of the several affiliated colleges, nor those of the University itself, shared his own belief as to the vital importance of such an examination, or were disposed to look upon it in any other light than that of a purely voluntary exercise, he abandoned the contest, and in a sorrowful and dignified letter addressed to the Chancellor on November 9, 1838, he finally resigned all connection with the University.

It will be generally admitted that the subsequent history of the University has not verified either the hopes or the fears of those who, fifty years ago, indulged in the most confident forecasts of its future. It has not justified the alarm of the authorities of Oxford and Cambridge by diminishing the *prestige* or attractiveness of those ancient foundations. It has not injured but rather helped and strengthened those medical schools and corporations in London, which at first protested against its claim to award medical degrees. It has not become, as many apprehended, a nursery for dissidents and agnostics, or developed a novel and heretical school of opinion in ethics, history, or psychology. On the other hand, those who hoped it would bring together into one system all the higher teaching agencies in the Metropolis, and make London a great seat of learning, such as was Athens or Alexandria, Paris or Bologna, have found the result disappointing. Nor has the experience of the University demonstrated, as some hoped, the absolute superiority of the professorial over the tutorial system of instruction. In the sense in which Oxford, Glasgow, or Bonn, possesses a University—an organized body of teachers confederated for the purpose of attracting scholars, guiding their studies, and encouraging learning by appropriate rewards—London still remains without a local University worthy of its metropolitan

metropolitan position, its population, and its intellectual repute.

There is no reason, however, why the title of University should be restricted to institutions of one type. The word 'Universitas' is elastic enough. It originally meant little more than a community or brotherhood, and was applied to any society which had a corporate life and interests of its own, and sometimes even to trading guilds. But in its later and ordinary meaning the word has come to denote a *studium generale*, a *schola*, a gymnasium, a corporate body and buildings dedicated to the pursuit of the higher learning. The ideal of such an institution has never been more gracefully portrayed than by Cardinal Newman in one of the memorable papers which he contributed to the 'Catholic University Gazette,' while the project of a great Catholic University in Dublin yet looked hopeful, and before the inevitable hour of disenchantment, which alas! closes the history of so many fair hopes and visions in Ireland, had even given warning of its approach.

'It is the place to which a thousand schools make contributions; in which the intellect may safely range and speculate, sure to find its equal in some antagonist activity, and its judge in the tribunal of truth. It is a place where enquiry is pushed forward, and discoveries verified and perfected, and rashness rendered innocuous, and error exposed by the collision of mind with mind, and knowledge with knowledge. It is the place where the professor becomes eloquent, and a missionary and preacher of science, displaying it in its most complete and winning form, pouring it forth with the zeal of enthusiasm, and lighting up his own love of it in the breasts of his hearers. It is the place where the catechist makes good his ground as he goes, treading in the truth day by day into the ready memory, wedging and tightening it into the expanding reason. It is a place which attracts the affections of the young by its fame, wins the judgment of the middle-aged by its beauty, and rivets the memory of the old by its associations. It is a seat of wisdom, a light of the world, a minister of the faith, an *Alma mater* of the rising generation.'

It will hardly be contended that the University of London, or indeed any existing foundation, corresponds to this picture. It does not embody the more limited conception of Bacon, of Gresham, of Buck, or of Cowley; and it differs in many important particulars, even from the institution which its own founders, Campbell, Brougham, and Tooke, intended to establish. Fifty years have effected a great change. The history of institutions, no less than that of other organisms, is subject to the law of evolution. They grow and shape themselves not always according to the predetermined plans of their founders,

but

but according to the conditions of their environment, and the new phenomena and experiences of the life they live. Some of the objects once contemplated cease to be either attainable or desirable, and other objects come into view in their place. New and unexpected means of usefulness disclose themselves from time to time: opportunities are embraced; and in this way an institution, if it has real vitality in it, assumes a form and character of its own and is able to adapt itself all the more readily to the pressing needs of changing times, because its character has not been fixed and stereotyped according to the views which were prevalent in the age of its birth. It is some compensation for the absence of venerable traditions, and ancient statutes, if a modern institution, such as the University of London, is for this very reason, all the freer to place itself in harmonious relations with new surroundings, and to undertake new work. Herein the corporate life of institutions often resembles, not inaptly, a human life. A man's career, his character, his destiny, do not often correspond exactly to the preconceived plans of his parents, or even to his own. He traces out the chart of his life, he chooses for himself his pursuit, his creed, his party. But new conditions affect him. 'Fresh woods and pastures new' invite him. Some of the avenues, by which he hoped to find his way to honour and usefulness, prove to be prematurely closed; some others, from which he had hoped but little, prove to be full of promise. If he be a wise man, he will not rebel against these conditions. He will be fain to say with Wordsworth:—

'Not for this
Faint I, nor mourn, nor murmur; other gifts
Have followed; for such loss I would believe
Abundant recompense.'

He will recognize in the teaching of experience the 'divinity that shapes our ends;' will balance fairly the losses and the gains of life; will not indulge in vain regrets over the lost or the impossible; but will make the most of the actual and the practicable, thankful if only, even by ways which he knew not, he has been enabled to achieve the best of which he is capable, and to lead a noble and fruitful life.

One of the characteristics of the new University, to which, in its early days, the greatest importance was attached, disappeared after twenty years' experience. The original Charter empowered the Senate to receive, as candidates for degrees, no other persons than students in University and King's Colleges, and other affiliated institutions named in the Charter. Among
these

these were the principal Nonconformist Colleges in London, Birmingham, and Manchester; the Roman Catholic Seminaries at Stonyhurst, Ware, and Bath, and in two or three places in Ireland; the Queen's Colleges at Birmingham and Liverpool, and afterwards Owens College, Manchester; the Wesleyan Colleges at Taunton and Sheffield, and other provincial institutions. This restriction was intended to serve as a security, that the graduate not only possessed knowledge, but had obtained it in an institution of academical rank, and after receiving a systematic course of instruction. But it soon became apparent, that these affiliated institutions, several of which were hardly Colleges, but merely secondary schools of good repute, interpreted studentship in very different ways, and that some of them competed with each other in relaxing the conditions on which the needful certificate for the University was granted. University College itself was one of the earliest and most conspicuous transgressors in this respect. Its Charter was scarcely ten years old when Brougham, with the restlessness and the impatient craving for immediate results which were characteristic of him, persuaded the College Council to open evening classes, ostensibly for schoolmasters, and to grant a certificate of studentship to any one who attended these classes. In this, and in other ways, it soon became evident, that the certificate afforded no guarantee that the student had received a regular course of academic instruction, or was in any real or practical sense a member of a College at all. Yet the governing body of the University had no power to reject certificates thus granted, or to criticize the regulations under which the affiliated Colleges awarded them. It possessed no visitorial authority over the Colleges, and no right to enquire into their methods of teaching, or to suggest improvements. Sir George Young has truly said: 'For complete affiliation two things are necessary—a representation of the affiliating body in the administration of the affiliated bodies, and a representation of the affiliated bodies in the administration of the affiliating body.' But neither of these conditions was fulfilled or could possibly be fulfilled under the original constitution of the University. The sole means possessed by the Senate of testing the efficiency of the Colleges was the examination of their students; and its sole means of influencing the course and character of the teaching was to be found in its schemes and regulations for examination. To the business of examination, therefore, it practically confined itself, and by general consent, it was allowed to discharge this duty well. The most eminent experts in various departments of learning were from time to time enlisted in its service

as examiners; public confidence in their ability and fairness was established, and the number of candidates for degrees annually increased. During the first twenty years 3413 persons presented themselves for matriculation, of whom 2755 passed. About 1000 of these proceeded to the degree in Arts, 586 to the first of the M.B. examinations, 343 to the full degree and 174 to the grade of M.D.

It had been from the first intended that, when the number of graduates became sufficiently large, they should be admitted to some share in the corporate life and the government of the University; and in 1858 a new Charter was obtained from the Crown, entitling graduates of a certain standing to meet in Convocation to discuss matters relating to the welfare of the University, and to nominate a certain proportion of members to the Senate. Opportunity was also taken, at this time, to reconsider the whole question of the relation of the University to the so-called affiliated Colleges. Many of the graduates contended earnestly for the maintenance of the collegiate connection and of the certificate of studentship. But on the other hand it could not be denied, that the connection was unreal, and the certificate often worthless. The system served only to give a certain educational status and importance to some institutions of a very inferior type, and to exclude from the privileges of the University many students of merit, whose place of residence put it out of their power to become even nominally members of a College, but who were none the less carefully educated by private instructors or erudite parents. We take, from the interesting *brochure* of M. Buisson, an estimate by a very shrewd foreign observer of the situation thus created:—

‘Le Sénat, qui était entré résolument dans la voie du progrès et qui comprenait que le prestige de la nouvelle Université et le secret de son succès viendraient surtout de son caractère moderne et de son émancipation des coutumes scolastiques du moyen âge, ne se laissa pas intimider par une opposition qu’il savait devoir être temporaire: le système des certificats d’étude avait du reste de grands inconvénients; il écartait des concours de l’Université beaucoup de candidats méritants, souvent des esprits d’élite, que celle-ci aurait été heureuse et fière d’accueillir dans son sein. Il empêchait surtout l’Université de la métropole d’acquérir cette expansion, cette large universalité que devait lui donner d’abord sa position au centre du pays, puis son caractère d’institution nationale supportée par l’État, enfin son esprit libéral et séculier.’—Buisson, p. 9.

The controversy respecting the certificate of studentship was finally settled by the introduction into the Charter of 1858, of a clause

a clause dispensing with this condition altogether, and admitting, under proper testimony as to character, all comers to the examinations in Arts and Laws. For medical degrees, evidence of regular attendance and clinical practice at some recognized medical institution was still required, but otherwise all the distinctions of the University were henceforth to be gained solely by proficiency as shown in examination; and the collegiate system, if so it might be called, passed out of existence altogether. Acquiescing in the conclusion, that its functions were now to be confined to examination, the Senate resolved on some important changes in its syllabus of studies; and, in particular, established a system of graded or intermediate examinations at stated intervals, which might furnish evidence of coherent and continuous study, and thus become an effective substitute for the certificate of attendance at College.

The subsequent increase in the number of candidates has been remarkable. In 1858 the candidates for matriculation numbered 299; in 1885 the number reached 1900. In 1858 there were 72 candidates for the degree of B.A. In 1885 those who presented themselves at the Intermediate Examination in Arts numbered 437, and at the final B.A. examination 339. In Medicine, instead of the 43 candidates for the degree of M.B., who came up in 1858, there were last year 228, and for the Doctorate in Medicine 73 instead of 21. The institution of degrees in Science in 1860 has still further added to the number of graduates, 1377 candidates having since that date presented themselves at the Intermediate Science Examination, of whom 697 have passed. The work of the first fifty years may be briefly summed up by the further statement, that in that time 17,200 persons have matriculated, 3056 have obtained the degree of B.A., 386 that of M.A., an exactly equal number that of LL.B., 1072 that of M.B., and 516 that of M.D. In the new Faculty of Science, 446 have reached the degree of B.Sc., and 73 that of D.Sc. The aggregate number of presentations for the examinations in all departments appears, from the statistics of the University, to have amounted to about 56,000.

These figures, however, do not measure the influence which the new institution has exerted upon the education of the country. In Colleges and schools throughout all parts of the United Kingdom and its dependencies, the regulations of the University, and its schemes of progressive study have had a material effect in raising and in defining the aims of teachers, and in stimulating their scholars to exertion. The Senate has no power to confer an honorary degree, and never permits any student to pass from one degree to another by the keeping
of

of terms or the performance of nominal acts or exercises. Each step is gained as the result of examination only; and at each step the requirements become more exacting; the Doctor of Science or the Master of Arts, being called on to give evidence of considerably fuller and more thorough knowledge than that required for the Bachelor's degree in the same faculty. All candidates, whatever be their ultimate destination, must enter by the one wicket-gate of matriculation. It would appear that the theory, on which the scheme for this examination is framed, is, that the youth of sixteen or upwards, if well instructed at school, and competent to enter on a higher course of academic study, ought to have attained a certain elementary, but not superficial, knowledge in each of the three departments of (1) Language, (2) Pure Science or Mathematics, (3) Physics or Experimental Science. Certain alternatives are permitted within each department; but in no one of the three is proficiency accepted as a substitute for a reasonable amount of attainment in either of the other two. At this early stage of his career the student is not encouraged to specialize, or to select his own line. But afterwards, at every step in his progress—at the Intermediate examination, at the degree of Bachelor, and at the degree of Doctor or Master—a larger choice of options is presented to him, the range of subjects he is required to take up becomes narrower, and the character of the examination becomes more searching. The whole educational fabric reared by the Senate and its examiners would seem to resemble a pyramid, of which the basis is broad, and each successive layer becomes smaller in area. Many complaints have been made, both of the severity, and of the breadth of the matriculation examination; but hitherto the Senate has always refused to recognize a person as qualified to become a candidate for any degree, who has not, by passing successfully through this portal, given evidence of the possession of at least the elements of a liberal education. It is probably for this reason that matriculation has come to serve many purposes not at first contemplated. It is accepted by many of the best teachers as a useful form of leaving examination—*Abiturienten-Examen*—and many scholars are encouraged to present themselves who have no intention of proceeding to a degree. Originally designed as a *terminus a quo*, relatively to a subsequent University course, it has become also recognized as a *terminus ad quem*, relatively to a good modern school course; and in hundreds of schools unconnected with any University, it has thus been the means of shaping the plans and encouraging the efforts of teachers. The examination is recognized by the legal and medical professions as a substitute for

for their own special examinations at admission; and by the Education Department as a qualification for service as assistant teachers.

Perhaps one of the most notable and effective means, whereby the University has influenced the character of teaching in schools and colleges, has been its prominent recognition of the usefulness of the vernacular language as a subject of systematic study. It was the first academic body in England to introduce a special department of English philology and literature among the conditions of the B.A. degree. The impetus thus given to the investigation of the history, structure, and affinities, of the English language, side by side with the study of Latin and Greek, has been largely felt in the higher schools of the country, and has not been without its effect on the older Universities. In the establishment of degrees in Science, London also took the first step, since it was by the nature of its constitution freer than older bodies to make innovations, and to add to the time-honoured list of academic designations the names of Bachelor and Doctor of Science. But it is probably in Medicine that the influence of the University of London has been most powerfully felt, and that its most conspicuous successes have been achieved. The medical schools, attached to hospitals in the largest city in the world, naturally afford to students unrivalled facilities for varied practice, and for the observation of all forms of disease; and these schools send their choicest pupils to the Metropolitan University. The number of medical graduates is however not commensurate either with the number of the schools, or with the repute of their teachers; and it has often been a subject of complaint, that the standard of qualification for a London degree has been fixed at so high a level, as to be practically unattainable to average members of the medical profession. On the other hand, it is generally admitted, that the requirements of the University have done much to encourage those higher studies and researches, on which the advancement of pathological and therapeutical science most depends. The University has probably influenced the profession profoundly and beneficially by confining its distinctions to the *élite* of medical students, and by setting up a high ideal of professional qualification. It may be doubted, whether an equally useful object would have been attained, if it had admitted ten times the number on easier conditions.

It would not be right to omit, in any narrative of the work of the University, the share it has taken in promoting the improved education of women. In 1867, the Senate sought from the Crown power to admit, for the first time, female candidates

to its examinations. The measure, however, which was taken in that year, was somewhat hesitating and tentative. A scheme was put forth providing special certificates for women only—the one general, the other of higher proficiency. In both examinations prominence was given to those subjects, in which it was presumed that women were likely to excel. But experience proved, that a special examination of this kind was not what was wanted either by the best of the female students or by their teachers. It soon appeared, that the distinctions, which were obtained by women in these examinations, were not in fact gained in subjects which were regarded as especially feminine, but in the classical languages and in science. Yet an examination, to which women alone were admissible, was generally understood to be lenient, and the certificate of success to be of inferior value. The leading teachers in schools and colleges of the highest rank for women wanted to know, both for themselves and for their pupils, how far the instruction they were giving corresponded to what was generally understood among men as the standard of a liberal education. They said in effect: 'It is premature to map out the *mundus intelligibilis*, and to say how much of it is masculine and how much is feminine. We do not and cannot yet know what kinds of intellectual aliment nature designed for men and women respectively. The *data* for the decision of this question are not before us. Why not try the experiment of letting students find this out for themselves? Throw open all the encouragements to learning to men and women alike. Have faith in the law of natural selection; offer freely the same courses of instruction to both, and see what comes of it. No harm can come of it. At any rate it is better to appeal to experience, than to determine the question beforehand, in the light of a crude, unverified, and possibly, erroneous theory, as to what sort of knowledge is best fitted for a woman, or what use she is likely to make of it. Whether, for example, the study of medicine may prove to be so fitted, or whether any woman is likely to achieve distinction or even moderate success as a medical practitioner, is a question which cannot be answered before actual trial. *Solvitur ambulando*. If there be natural disabilities, it is the less necessary that we should maintain artificial disabilities. Nature will take care of her own laws. Meanwhile chivalry and justice alike call upon men in authority to remove hindrances, and to permit women, in the exercise of their own free choice, to take advantage of just so much of the system of the University, as they think likely to be helpful to them in their own efforts after self-improvement, and no more.' The new

new Charter of 1878 was the response of the Senate and of Convocation to this appeal. By its provisions, every degree, honour, and reward, was made accessible to students of both sexes on perfectly equal terms. Soon some of the best and most vigorous of the higher places of education for girls, notably the Ladies' College at Cheltenham, Bedford College in London, and the North London Collegiate School, encouraged their choicest pupils to avail themselves of this concession. A school of medicine for female students was established in London, and attached to a hospital of repute. Between 1879 and 1885, 836 women passed the Matriculation Examination, 175 the Intermediate Examination for a degree in Arts, and 27 in Science; of whom 100 proceeded to the full degree in Arts, and 14 in Science; while 19 candidates passed, several of them with marked distinction, the examinations for degrees in Medicine. It should be added, that the authorities of the University of Cambridge have been scarcely less helpful in furthering the improved education of women. In 1881 it was resolved to admit women to the Previous Examination and to the Tripos Examinations. The degree itself, and all pecuniary rewards, fellowships and other University privileges, are for the present withheld; but the substance, of which these things are the symbols, is now placed freely within the reach of women; and the students of Girton and Newnham receive to all intents and purposes a University education, and due University recognition. There can be little doubt that, by the action of the two Universities, a great and needed stimulus has been given to the intellectual cultivation of the women of England; that many persons have become qualified by means of it for distinguished positions in the teaching and other professions; and that many more have carried with them into domestic life improved tastes, wider reading and mental experience, and greater power of exerting useful influence among their children and their friends.

Two or three other facts may fitly be added, to complete this brief record of the fortunes of the University during the first half century of its history. In 1870, after manifold wanderings from one temporary dwelling-place to another, it was housed by the Government in a comely and appropriate building in Burlington Gardens, opened with all due ceremony by Her Majesty. The Reform Bill of 1867 gave the graduates the right to elect a representative to the House of Commons. The view the members of Convocation have taken of their trust is best illustrated by the fact, that their present representative is Sir John Lubbock. Though not himself a graduate of the University, he

has taken an active share in its government; and his zeal for the promotion of learning and science, and the authority with which he speaks on many of those subjects in which legislation touches closely the intellectual life and interests of the nation, give him a special claim to the confidence of an academic constituency, and have gone far to remove the misgivings which many politicians entertain to the principle of the representation of the Universities in Parliament.

As to the public usefulness of the University, so far as it is to be measured by the worth and weight of the men whom it has produced, it is difficult to say much. It were invidious to select for special mention the names of living men; but the rolls of the University for the last fifty years constitute a very honourable record. Among those of its graduates, whose studies have been mainly directed by its requirements, and who are members of no other University, are included many of the most eminent of modern medical authorities, Presidents of the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians, a Lord Chancellor, a Master of the Rolls, several Judges and Cabinet Ministers, a considerable number of members of the Legislature, besides many others who have achieved distinction in letters, in science, and in the public service.

Much has been said of late about the proposal to establish 'a Teaching University in London,' and an influential association, of which Lord Reay and Sir George Young are among the leading members, has been formed with a view to the advocacy of this project. In the authorized Report of the Association, its objects are thus set forth:—

'1. The organization of University teaching in and for London, in the form of a Teaching University, with faculties of Arts, Science, Medicine, and Laws.

'2. The Association of University Examination with University Teaching, and the direction of both by the same authorities.

'3. The conferring of a substantive voice in the government of the University upon those engaged in the work of University Teaching and Examination.

'4. Existing Institutions in London, of University rank, not to be abolished, or ignored, but to be taken as the basis or component parts of the University, and either partially or completely incorporated with the minimum of internal changes.

'5. An alliance to be established between the University and the Professional Corporations, the Council of Legal Education, as representing the Inns of Court, and the Royal Colleges of Physicians and of Surgeons.'

It is urged by the promoters of this enterprise, that London is the

the only great capital which does not possess a University of the character thus described. The provision for teaching of the highest kind is not commensurate with the size and importance of the Metropolis. Such provision as exists is scattered and unrelated; and, owing to the rivalries of different governing bodies, not well economized. The recognized teachers in the great schools have no position, and little influence outside the walls of those institutions, and no power to control the examinations by which their students obtain degrees. 'The true function of a University,' it is urged by the Association, 'is to commend to students those systematic courses of teaching and methods of study under supervision, for the efficiency of which it is itself responsible.' But at present the only degree-conferring body in London has no cognizance of methods of study and of teaching, enquires into the *results* of instruction merely, and makes no distinction between the regularly educated man, who has studied under a competent professor, and the private student, who has obtained his information, it may be, in an unsatisfactory school, or by more or less unsound methods. Lord Reay truly complains that 'there is little or no corporate feeling among the promising young men who attend lectures,' and the Association urges, with equal truth, that there is in London 'no common forum, such as a University could supply, where the governing bodies and teachers could meet for the purposes of conference, and wherein measures for the better organization of teaching could be discussed and settled.' Nor is there at present any such *solidarité* on the part of the great professional corporations and the University as would facilitate the adaptation of the degree examinations to the changing circumstances and needs of the learned professions. For example, there is a very general desire among medical practitioners that the degree of M.D., which appears to be much appreciated by their patients, should be rendered more easily accessible. It is contended, that in Scotland the conditions imposed by the Universities are far less exacting than in London; and the teachers in the London medical schools not unnaturally complain, that a large number of their less ambitious pupils are attracted northwards, not for the purpose of obtaining better teaching, but in order to secure a degree on easier terms. Finally, it is urged, that it should be the first duty of a Metropolitan University to systematize the pursuit of learning and research in the Metropolis itself, and that this duty is not fulfilled by any existing institution.

These views have been received with much public favour, and the Association has succeeded in awakening considerable sympathy

sympathy among the graduates of the University itself. In January 1885, a special Committee of Convocation was appointed to consider and report upon the project, and the Committee, of which Lord Justice Fry was the Chairman, presented in July of that year an elaborate report proposing a complete reconstitution of the Senate, and the recognition of certain Metropolitan institutions as constituent colleges, of four Faculties—Arts, Laws, Science, and Medicine—each to be composed of professors and teachers, and of a Board of Studies in each Faculty to exercise large controlling power over the regulations and the examinations. This scheme, however, was not accepted by Convocation, and the whole subject was referred again to a Committee, of which Sir Philip Magnus was the Chairman; and in May of the following year that Committee presented its report, which was provisionally accepted by Convocation as a basis for conference with the Senate. This second report did not differ materially from the first, but it propounded a somewhat simpler scheme. Instead of the rather cumbrous machinery of four Faculties and four Boards of Studies, it proposed one consultative body, to be called a Council of Education, with power to appoint standing committees or Boards of Studies. But in its fundamental provisions it resembles both the former scheme of Lord Justice Fry, and the plan of the 'Association for Promoting a Teaching University.' These provisions are (1) the recognition of constituent colleges, all of which are to be in or near London, as the substantial part of the University; (2) the representation of certain professional corporations, which are not teaching bodies, *e.g.* the Council of Legal Education, the Incorporated Law Society, the Royal Society, and the College of Physicians and Surgeons on the University Senate; and (3) the relegation of the chief power and influence over the examinations to professors and teachers connected with the constituent Colleges.

The view which may be eventually taken of these proposals by the Senate and by the advisers of the Crown it is of course impossible to foretell. Their opinion will probably be determined by considerations, which do not weigh much with members of Convocation, and which weigh still less with an external body like the Association. Both these bodies are practically irresponsible, and to such bodies the task of carving out new schemes is comparatively easy. The framing of constitutions has always been a seductive employment, especially to those who were not likely to be encumbered with the responsibility of carrying them into effect. Meanwhile from our own point of view as disinterested spectators, solicitous only to maintain the
general

general interests of learning, and therefore disposed to regard the welfare of particular institutions merely as a means towards the attainment of this higher end, two or three questions occur which seem to need more careful investigation than they have yet received. Are the proposed objects of this Association desirable *in se*? Are they attainable? If so, is the present London University capable of being so transformed as to accomplish them?

Too little consideration appears to us to have been given to the fact, that the existing institution, whether it fulfils all the functions of a University or not, whether it is rightly named 'London' or not, has under its present Charter definite duties and responsibilities, which it is bound to discharge. It is not, it is true, a teaching body. But it never was designed or empowered to become a teaching body. Indeed it was on the distinct understanding, that it should renounce the function of teaching and confine itself to the duty of regulating and conducting examinations, that University College consented to forego its own claims and acquiesced in the granting of the present Charter. If the University does not now co-ordinate and bring into united action the various Colleges in London, it is because no authority to undertake such a work has ever been confided to it. It bears, it is true, the name of the metropolis, but it is not and never has been a local institution. Its objects are legally defined in the widest terms:—

'It is,' says the Charter, 'the duty of our royal office to hold forth to all classes and denominations of our faithful subjects without any distinction whatsoever an encouragement for pursuing a regular and liberal course of education; and considering that many persons do prosecute and complete their studies both in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, to whom it is expedient that there should be offered such facilities, and on whom it is just that there should be conferred such distinctions and rewards as may incline them to persevere in these their laudable pursuits':—

There is no geographical limitation here, and as a matter of fact scarcely one-fourth of the students, who present themselves for matriculation, have been educated in the metropolis, and a still smaller proportion come up from London Colleges. It is no reproach to the institution to say, that it is not fulfilling a conception which was never entertained by its founders or embodied in its charters. Unless it can be shown, that some great and decided public advantage may be expected to accrue, the authorities of the University will do well to pause before they divest it of its quasi-imperial character, restrict its action to a single city, and give up to London 'what was meant for mankind.'

mankind.' To do this would be to part with great opportunities of public usefulness, and with all the influence which the regulations of the University now exert over distant colleges, scattered all over the Empire, over high schools, grammar schools, and training colleges, and over the ever-increasing number of privately-taught and secluded students.

The means of academic instruction in London appear in the eyes of an educated foreigner to be inadequate for a city of four millions of inhabitants. Nevertheless they are certainly in excess of the demand. Better teaching and more highly skilled professors than are to be found in University and King's Colleges, and at the new Technical Institute of the City and Guilds of London, are not to be had in any part of England. But those institutions are not full. The medical schools are so numerous, that they in some cases injure one another by rivalry. It is manifest that, if by the founding of a Teaching University is meant the addition of new educational establishments to the resources of London, and the creation of a new teaching body, there is great danger of injuring or weakening existing institutions. One great want indeed has to be supplied. For courses of lectures of a high and scholarly kind, designed not for young men who are reading for degrees, but for students of a maturer type, (such lectures as at the Sorbonne or the Collège de France, are given from time to time by a Cousin, a Michelet, or a Guizot), we have in London no public provision. The establishment of such a scheme, as would give opportunities to the most eminent authorities in literature and science to concentrate the researches of a life into a few memorable discourses, and thus make permanent additions to the higher learning, is a task worthy of a University, and would not in any way interfere with the regular work of the teaching Colleges. If means and endowment are forthcoming, there is no reason why such a task should not be undertaken; but there is no evidence to show that, if the University were transformed according to the views of the Association, the task would be easier than it would be under the present government. And it is a very significant fact, that so far as has yet been disclosed, the Association has received no promises of pecuniary support, and has not indicated the source whence it hopes to obtain the large sum necessary for the completion of its project.

It is, however, urged that, though we may not need additional teaching agencies in London, we greatly need some means of co-ordinating existing agencies, of economizing them by a right division of labour, and giving greater unity to the higher teaching of London. A federation of London Colleges seems

at first sight eminently desirable. But federation implies limitation; and concession, if not to a superior authority, at least to the conflicting claims of the various associated bodies. There are, for example, many small medical schools in London, and each of them desires that its students shall look to it for a complete course of professional training. Yet some of them are notoriously ill-provided with apparatus, or laboratories, or with teaching power in special departments. What is to be desired is a friendly arrangement between the schools and hospitals for inter-collegiate lectures, and for such a division of duty and of fees as should enable any student to obtain the best teaching that any of the medical schools affords. But this implies, on the part of the governing bodies, self-denying ordinances, and mutual help. The plan could not be enforced by any external authority; it needs to be spontaneously and voluntarily adopted; and it could be adopted now, if it were seriously desired, without waiting for a reorganized University to suggest it. In like manner it may seem desirable that all the great educational institutions—the Inns of Court, the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, the Schools of Science and Art, and the British Museum, should work in harmony with the principal colleges and schools, and regard themselves as forming part of one great Metropolitan University. But there would be no meaning in such an organization, unless each constituent of it was willing to part with its autonomy, and to subject its regulations to revision and criticism. At present, so far as we are aware, no one of these bodies has expressed the least wish to be thus associated, or the least readiness to surrender its own independence. Several of them have, it is understood, consented to nominate representatives on the governing body of a new University, but none have intimated their willingness to recognize the authority of such a body over themselves. It is nowise self-evident, that their work would be more efficiently done, if they were united under a common name; but it is certain that such a union, to be of any value, should be real and not only nominal. It should provide for an actual comity and mutual subordination of interests, and should not expose itself to the Irish criticism on Free Trade, that the reciprocity will be all on one side.

In the discussions on this subject, much stress is laid upon the undoubted truth, that examining is only one part, and not the noblest part, of the functions of a University. A degree should connote, not merely the possession of such knowledge as can be tested by examination, but discipline, nurture, manliness, intellectual fellowship. An undergraduate of Oxford

or

or Cambridge gains during his residence preparation for the University examinations; but he gains much more. He is a member of an ancient society; he is the inheritor of noble and venerable traditions; he walks in 'studious cloisters pale,' and under the elms which shaded Newton or Milton; he sees round him the memorials of the great dead who have fashioned the spiritual life of the nation; he shares with students of his own age the sports, the debates, the reading, the conflict of wits, the strenuous ambition; and inhales all the while the many nameless influences which make up the atmosphere of a great seat of learning. These things are in themselves an education; his actual acquirements, as finally shown in his examination in the Schools or for the Tripos, are only a part, and not the greatest part, of the mental and social advantages which his degree represents. It is well that we should clear our minds of illusions, and admit once for all that, for a degree of this kind, a Metropolitan University, whose students live at home or in lodgings, cannot under any conceivable arrangements offer an exact equivalent. The *camaraderie* and the emulation may or may not exist; but it is difficult to say how they could be enforced in any non-residential University, least of all in so vast and heterogeneous a community as that of London.

It is, however, the belief of many persons whose opinions are entitled to much deference, that in some modified form the collegiate system, abandoned in 1858, might be with advantage revived, and that a London degree might be made to represent, not merely proficiency in learning, but proficiency attained in an academic institution, and under the tuition of responsible professors. It is urged that irregular and unauthorized teachers degrade learning and encourage 'cram,' and that a degree gained by their means is of inferior value. Professor Henry Morley actually proposes that, while the London University may be properly left free to give under its existing regulations degrees to all comers, it should at the same time institute other degrees to be confined to those who had been regularly instructed in public institutions of repute; the University thus having two sides—a teaching and an examining side—the distinctions conferred on the former side having a superior educational value. All such arguments presuppose, that professorial teaching is necessarily and in all circumstances the best, and that 'coaches' and 'crammers' are illegitimate intruders into the domain of education. But this hypothesis must not be accepted without some qualifications. 'Cram' is an odious word, and has, as it has been truly said, come to be used in a loose way to designate any particular form

of

of teaching which the speaker may happen to dislike, or wish to discredit. But if by 'cram' is meant knowledge dishonestly acquired, pretentious and unreal knowledge, the 'getting up' for a temporary purpose of information not properly assimilated, and doomed to be speedily forgotten, we are all alike interested in discountenancing it, and it is the special business of a skilled examiner to detect it. 'Crammed' or superficially prepared men come up in great numbers for examination, but, when the examiner knows his business, they do not pass. And experience does not justify us in concluding, either that 'cram' is the characteristic method of private tutors, or that it is wholly absent from the lecture-rooms of professors. The truth is, that each mode of teaching has its special advantages and disadvantages. The professor in a Scotch University is generally a man of high reputation; and it is a great privilege for a young student to be stimulated by his personal influence, and to listen to his lectures. But the classes are large, and the amount of actual mental intercourse between professor and pupil is very small. There is little or no recognition of individual difficulties, or adaptation of the teaching to individual needs. And it is notorious that the borrowing of notes from hand to hand prevails to a great extent, and goes far to relieve the less diligent of the students from any serious attention to the professor at all. On the other hand, the system which prevails at Oxford and Cambridge is essentially a tutorial system. A Seeley, or a Ruskin, may occasionally draw large audiences to University lectures; but the real work of the University is done in private, in small groups, and in the rooms of tutors. Many a man has kept his terms in the University, and obtained a good degree, who has never heard a professor's voice. And when some of the advocates of a Teaching University claim for learners who have been taught by professors superiority over all others, and describe such a University as one which proposes to rescue students from the hands of private tutors, it may be well to remind them that, in this sense, neither Oxford nor Cambridge is a teaching University, but that nearly all the actual instruction obtained in them is got from men who, if they happened to practise their profession in London, would be disdained as 'crammers.'

To the end of time, the true seekers after knowledge will never be able to dispense with the aid to be obtained from the personal influence of great teachers; and though the best of their teaching is now embodied in books, and books are more accessible than ever, the *vis viva* of the human voice, the stimulating presence, the sympathy of numbers, will always be among the

the most potent factors in education; and the professorial or lecture system, when it is in right hands, will not fail to attract many of the choicest students. But it is not the only system by which genuine knowledge can be acquired. And having regard to the multiplied agencies which now exist for the diffusion of learning, and to the very different conditions under which it may be acquired, it would seem inexpedient for a public authority to affirm *à priori* that any one method of teaching is necessarily the best, or to give special recognition to knowledge obtained in one particular way. Under no imaginable re-arrangement of our educational apparatus could a Metropolitan University provide any really effective substitute for the collegiate residence of the older Universities. Nor without doing serious harm to public education, could it depart materially from its present principle of action:—

‘Cuncti adsint, meritaque expectent præmia palmæ.’

Examination of results must in any case be the main duty of a degree-conferring body in London; and in the discharge of this duty it should be ready to recognize impartially every form of sound and honest work, to perfect its tests, and to admit to its honours the professorially taught man, the privately taught man, and the solitary student, on equal terms. The proposal to establish ‘Boards of Studies,’ with power to report on the results of examination in particular subjects, and *on the teaching thereof*, has been accepted both by the Association and by members of Convocation, without, we think, sufficient consideration. It is difficult to understand by what machinery, other than by examination, a central body could determine, that the methods of instruction adopted in one college were better than those of another, or by what means, other than by the publication of the results of examination, it could usefully control the systems adopted in colleges. Methods of instruction differ, and ought to differ. Variety, independence, originality, are the great safeguards for genuine improvement in the art of teaching; and the criticism of a central body on the mode of instruction in an affiliated institution, even if not resented by its teachers as intrusive and *ultra vires*, would certainly have a mischievous effect on the freedom and freshness of teaching.

But the strongest point in the contention of the reforming Association is the complaint, that the present University is not in sufficiently close connection with the teaching profession. The whole movement has been largely promoted by the most eminent professors and teachers in London, who complain, not without

without reason, that they have no official status which gives them a right to be consulted, and that the courses of instruction prescribed by the University are not always such as they know to be the best for their own students. The offices of teaching and examining, they contend, ought not to be separated, but should be under a common control. Indeed, it is sometimes retorted that what after all is being aimed at is a *Teachers' University*; and liberty for professors—as a former Cabinet Minister irreverently said—to ‘brand their own herrings.’ In so far, however, as the new movement aims at establishing a more intimate relation between the central authority and the great body of teachers whose pupils come up for degrees, it is undoubtedly justified; and it seeks to remedy a real defect in the present constitution of the University. It is remarkable, however, that the professors of the London Colleges do not seem to have been always sensible of this defect. In a very clear and effective statement put forth by the Council and Professors of University College in 1835, and signed by the Duke of Somerset as Chairman, the proprietors of the College are strongly advised to accept the compromise then offered to them by the Crown:—

‘The Government plan,’ they say, ‘removes a difficulty which has been felt whenever the subject of a Charter has been discussed. The professors will not have to confer degrees upon their own pupils. It is right enough that teachers should examine their pupils in order to judge of their proficiency, or even determine their relative merit among themselves; but there is an obvious objection to teachers conferring upon their own pupils titles of honour, which are to pass current in the world at large. They are under a temptation to lower the standard of their honours, and even if they conscientiously maintain it at a proper height, they are always exposed to suspicion. . . . The plan proposed gets rid of this difficulty. A Board of Examiners will be constituted altogether distinct from the professors. The University (College) will be at no cost, and it cannot be doubted, that gentlemen of the very highest reputation as scholars and men of science will undertake this office upon the nomination of the Crown. The degrees which they will confer will hold a far higher rank in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of the graduates themselves, than degrees conferred merely by our own Institution.’

The argument in favour of independence and intellectual detachment on the part of the degree-conferring body could not be better stated. Yet experience, while not refuting this argument, has shown that it may be pushed too far, and needs to be qualified by other considerations. It is generally understood that the Senate of the University of London has often consulted the authorities of the leading Colleges in relation to proposed changes

changes in the curriculum. But such consultation, if merely voluntary and occasional, does not suffice to keep the University thoroughly informed as to the latest improvements in methods of teaching, or to secure the fullest confidence of teachers as a class. It is impossible, that any scheme of representation of the interests and views of teachers could be co-extensive with the whole field of the University's present action. But it ought not to be difficult to devise a plan, whereby consultative Councils, composed of representatives of the four faculties of Arts, Laws, Medicine, and Science, might be formed, with a definite status, and with power to advise the Senate in relation to all changes in the scheme of studies, the conditions of graduation, and the conduct of the examinations. For this purpose the choice should be made, not exclusively from the institutions which happen to be situated in London, but also from the most important of the provincial Colleges, from the Nonconformist institutions, and from such Catholic Colleges as have from the first availed themselves largely of the University's examinations and have contributed to its rolls many able scholars. Representative Councils thus constituted would be in complete sympathy with the best modern advances in education, and would be able to render the most valuable service to the Senate in shaping the conditions of its examinations.

But the true worth of all speculations, in regard to the future government of the University, must ultimately be determined by their relation to the character and scope of the functions, which, in the future, the institution is destined to fulfil. If its work is to be materially altered, the machinery, by which that work is to be effected, must be altered and adapted also. The question raised by recent controversies practically assumes this form: Is the University to become a purely metropolitan institution, having relations exclusively to London students, to London academical organization, and to London teachers, or is it to retain its cosmopolitan character, and to continue, as heretofore, to render service to the general education of the country? At present its executive body—the Senate—is constituted solely with a view to the right discharge of this latter duty. It is composed to a large extent of men of eminence in literature, in science, and in academic and public life, and also in part, of the more distinguished of former University examiners. Three-fourths of the whole number are appointed directly by the Crown, and one-fourth from a list submitted to the Crown by the graduates in Convocation. But it would seem that the nominees, both of the Crown and of the graduates, have been appointed from time to time, without any reference

to

to the representation of particular local institutions, or of sectional or professional interests, but solely because of their presumed acquaintance with various forms of educational work, and their sympathy with the larger interests of learning. The 'Association for promoting a Teaching University for London,' however, is perfectly consistent in demanding, as a first step, a drastic and revolutionary change in the constitution of the Senate. For, in the view of that Association, the prime duty, if not the only legitimate duty, of the University is to effect the re-organization of academic teaching in London; and it matters little whether the present work done by the Senate in encouraging the efforts of non-collegiate or provincial students is well or ill done, or whether it continues to be done at all. Accordingly the Association invites the University to fashion a new governing body of an exclusively local and professional type, and to empower this body to grant degrees of an academic character to London students only. This new body, we may assume, is intended either to supersede the present Senate altogether, or to discharge its own special functions, side by side with that body; and thus form a separate department or 'teaching wing' of a re-constituted London University.

To the second of these proposals, the objections are grave and very manifest. A central body under one name, giving at the same time to two different classes of students, degrees and honours of different characters, and under different conditions, would place itself in a wholly novel and untenable position, and would be confronted with enormous practical difficulties, as to the relative value of the distinctions it conferred, and the status of the several classes of its graduates. On the other hand, to recast the governing body solely in the interests of London, and London schools, and yet to confide to such a body the duty at present fulfilled by the University, as an Examining Board for students in all parts of the Empire, would be obviously unwise and inequitable; for it is not to be supposed that the authorities of provincial colleges and schools, and the hundreds of students now working with private tutors or in classes at a distance from the metropolis, would feel the same confidence in such a body, as in the present Senate. The practical question, therefore, before the friends of the University would seem to be—How far is it possible, by some one cautious and moderate measure of re-adjustment, to meet the reasonable views of London teachers, and at the same time to continue the present work of the University without any sacrifice of efficiency and public favour? And in the solution of this problem, it may be hoped that two considerations of cardinal importance will not be

be overlooked. (1) That it is not by the separate and distinct representation of rival colleges, or rival groups of teachers, but rather by the introduction into the University system of a body of advisers, representing the views and wishes of teachers as a profession and as a class, that the University can be effectually strengthened; and (2) That any such council should be consultative only, not administrative; and should perform its duties subject in all respects to the control and approval of one governing body, responsible not only to the London public, but to the whole nation. The various proposals for Faculties, Boards of Studies, Councils of Education, Representatives of Inns of Court and of Medical Corporations, present to the eye of any one familiar with public business a somewhat bewildering prospect of conflicting interests and divided counsels. And these evils, as well as the more serious danger so clearly indicated in the unanimous testimony of the Council and Professors of University College in 1835—the danger of lowering the public estimation of University degrees by permitting them to be awarded to students at the discretion of their own teachers—can only be averted by preserving to the Senate as the supreme governing body, its absolute independence, and its undivided responsibility.

It has been a very significant feature of recent discussions, that one object, strongly advocated by some of the reformers from without, was promptly disavowed by the graduates of the University assembled in the House of Convocation. The wish to obtain a cheap and easy medical degree was very natural on the part of many of the humbler medical practitioners, who found the title of M.D. useful to them in obtaining practice, but who were unwilling to comply with the conditions exacted by the Senate. They complained of the severity of the Matriculation examination, and especially of regulations which required a knowledge of Botany, or of the laws of reasoning, or any subject which was merely ancillary to medical studies, and which had no visible relation to the requirements of medical practice. But the graduates appear to have given no encouragement to this complaint, and to have expressed a decisive objection to any reduction in the present requirements for a medical degree. In this they evinced a true instinct. Mere licences to practise may be obtained from medical corporations, on the ground of professional qualification only. But the M.D. of a University is, or ought to be, not only a licensed medical practitioner, but something more. He should have received a liberal education, and should have devoted some attention to those studies which, if not bearing immediately upon the duties

of

of his profession, nevertheless serve to broaden his intellectual horizon, and to place the special work of his life in its true relation to other departments of human culture. If a University degree does not imply this, it has no longer any *raison d'être*. It is not the chief business of a University to add recruits to the rank and file of the professions: still less is it its duty to propitiate Mrs. Grundy by decorating all her favourite medical attendants with titles. But it is its duty to set up a high standard of professional qualification, and to use its influence in such a way as to encourage the worthiest students to attain that standard.

On a review of the whole situation, we are inclined to conclude that, while some of the objects contemplated by the reforming Association are, even if desirable, hopelessly unattainable by any modification of the existing University, several of those objects might be secured with great advantage, and without impairing or dislocating the machinery which is now at work. If by a Teaching University for London is meant a local institution for the Metropolis, adapting its examinations to the needs of London students as interpreted by their own professors, it is scarcely to be expected that any institution, already possessing an œcumenical character, will be content thus to restrict itself, or to admit that the interests of a few London teachers are wholly identical with the true interests of the public at large. But if, on the other hand, the University of London, without parting with any of its present means of usefulness, will strengthen itself by admitting to its councils representative teachers, who, though not dominant, shall be honoured and influential, the present discussions will have had a valuable result. The University must not permit itself to be beguiled by programmes, however attractive, into undertaking work which it is unable to perform thoroughly well. But by availing itself of the help and suggestions of skilled teachers, it would greatly enlarge the area of its present work, and become qualified to do that work still better. Increased confidence would be felt in its fairness and wisdom, even by the unrepresented schools and colleges which supply it with candidates. New agencies for the encouragement of learning would by degrees cluster round and attach themselves to it. Endowments and gifts for the promotion of special studies will come to it from time to time; and in the second half century of its existence, on which it is now entering, it may reasonably hope for a large extension of numbers and repute, and of useful and beneficent influence.

- ART. III.—1. *Naucratis*; Part I., 1884–5; the third Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund. By W. M. Flinders Petrie; with chapters by Cecil Smith, Ernest Gardner, and Barclay V. Head. London, 1886.
2. *Geschichte Aegyptens, von Psammetich I. bis auf Alexander den Grossen.* Von Dr. Alfred Wiedemann. Leipzig, 1880.

IT has more than once fallen to us to draw attention to discoveries, throwing much light on ancient Greek history and manners, made on the soil of Greece by Dr. Schliemann and other German excavators. It is with still greater satisfaction that we have at present to record the results of successful excavations, made mostly by Englishmen, which are of not less interest to lovers of Greek history and literature, though made not in Greek lands, but in Egypt.

During the four years which have elapsed since the bombardment of Alexandria by the English fleet, learned excavators, equipped by the Egypt Exploration Fund, have been at work in the Delta; and from their labours important discoveries have resulted in both Biblical and Classical geography. M. Naville has determined the position of Pithom-Succoth, the first station of the Jewish Exodus, as well as of the capital of the Land of Goshen. Mr. Petrie has identified the palace of Pharaoh at Tahpanhes, a spot very notable in the story of the later Jewish Captivity; and has further discovered and excavated, with the help of Mr. Ernest Gardner, the site of Naucratis, the meeting-point in the seventh century, B.C., of Egyptian and Greek, and the fulcrum by which the enterprising Hellenic race brought the power of their arms and of their wits to bear on the most ancient and venerable empire in the world. We must leave it to others to speak of the gains thus resulting to Biblical archæology; our intention is to sketch, in the light of the newly-discovered facts, the relations between the ancient Greeks and Egyptians down to the final establishment of a Greek dynasty in Egypt.

Whether the first contact between Egyptian and Greek can be traced so far back as the thirteenth century before the Christian era is the subject of a notable controversy. On the walls of the temple at Medinet Habu is painted a wonderful record of invasions of Egypt by great allied armies coming from the north, a record which for completeness and vigour is surpassed only by the memorable tapestry of Bayeux which records the Norman invasion of England. But the fate of Egypt's invaders was not that of the Normans; they are said to have been defeated successively by the warlike Pharaohs Menephtah II. and Rameses III., and either slain or reduced to slavery. Of their

their ships, their arms, and their ethnological character, the wall-paintings give us a vivid representation, and their nationalities are reported in the hieroglyphic text which runs with the scenes of conflict and triumph. Nevertheless the best authorities are not agreed as to who the invading armies were and whence they came. There is no doubt that their main force consisted of Libyans, but with the Libyans came as allies other races, Pulosata, Tekkari, Danaü, Shardana, Leku, Turisha, and Akaiuasha. Wiedemann considers that all these races dwelt near the frontiers of Egypt; Brugsch identifies them with the peoples of Asia Minor, the Teucri, Lycians, Sardians, and the like; while Chabas and Maspero incline to spread them over a still wider area, and regard the invading army as a great confederacy drawn from the northern and eastern shores of the Ægean Sea by the hope of conquest and plunder. Certainly the theory that the contingents called those of the Danaü and Akaiuasha consisted of Danaans and Achæans, and so of men of Hellenic race, is very tempting, and is as yet by no means disproved.

But whether the Greeks took part in the invasions of Egypt in the thirteenth century or not, it is interesting to find that such great expeditions were not unknown at that early period in the Mediterranean. That the Greeks would not be behind other peoples in organizing them we may be sure from our own knowledge of the Greek character. And tradition lends ample countenance to this conviction. The two sieges of Ilium, the two expeditions against Thebes, certainly had historical prototypes, and the Argonautic expedition is a reflection in the mirage of tradition of many a voyage of banded heroes or pirates sailing from the Greek ports in quest of plunder or adventure. Odysseus beguiled the divine swineherd Eumæus with a feigned story, how he had set sail from Crete with a pirate crew, and made a descent on the coast of Egypt; and how the king of the country, with many chariots, came out of the city, and put his companions to the sword, and carried himself away captive, just as Menephthah and Rameses slew and captured the invaders from the north. Nor would Homer have put such a tale into the mouth of Odysseus, unless it had been a tale of every-day life and plausible on the face of it. There were certain times in the course of their expansion when even Goths and Gauls, though not maritime peoples, organized great expeditions by sea; swarming times when, like colonies of those most political animals ants and bees, they wandered out boldly in search of new seats; but we cannot think that a people so naturally fond of the sea as the Greeks would at any time in their history be

unable or unwilling to swarm in search of new lands or in order to escape over-population at home.

But in any case, military or piratical expeditions would not bring the Greeks into real contact with the art, the civilization, and the politics of the Egyptians: to be fruitful, intercourse between nations must be peaceful and leisurely.

Most of us are familiar with the delightful tale of Herodotus which narrates how Psammitichus, one of the chiefs among whom Egypt was divided in the middle of the seventh century B.C., became an object of suspicion to his neighbours, and how they drove him out as an exile into the Delta; how an oracle informed him that he should be set on the throne of Egypt by bronze men from the sea, and how these bronze auxiliaries appeared in the persons of Ionian and Carian sea-farers clad in armour, who did really win for the exile a way to the throne of the Pharaohs. And however much the critical writers of the new school, such as Wiedemann, and Sayce, and Busolt, may warn us against the moralizing tendencies and imperfect information of Herodotus, men will always find a difficulty in doubting the truth of his stories. For ourselves, we are often disposed to take the part of Herodotus against modern criticism, which is apt to err through supposing that people in ancient days always acted reasonably, and valued motives according to the scale of Bentham. Even Wiedemann, though possessed of admirable judgment, is inclined to reject those stories of Herodotus in which oracular responses play a leading part, and we cannot think that he is justified in so doing; with moderns, reasons of State would outweigh the worth of an oracular response; but we know for certain that among the less advanced of the Greeks, such as Lacedæmonians and Megarians, oracular advice would outweigh any reasons of expediency, and there seems every reason to suppose that the same frame of mind would prevail in the barbarian kings, who at the dawning of Greek history had learned to value the advice of the Hellenic Zeus and Apollo as delivered at their oracles.

We know, indeed, from monumental evidence* that Psammitichus reigned as colleague of the last Ethiopian king of Egypt, Nut-Amen, and presumably succeeded him, but it can scarcely be doubted that he had great difficulty in making his nominal supremacy real. Whether he was led by an oracle, or by any other inducement, to seek the friendship of the Greeks and Carians, we are justified by a passage in Strabo in supposing that the Milesians were among his most important allies.

* Wiedemann, '*Ägyptische Geschichte*,' (1884) p. 597. A stone at Boulak bears side by side the cartouches of Nut-Amen and of Psammitichus I.

Strabo says that in the time of Psammitichus, whom he rightly states to have been contemporary with Cyaxares the Mede, the Milesians sailed with thirty ships into the Bolbitine mouth of the Nile, and erected a small fortress; and that afterwards they sailed up to the Saitic nome, and vanquished in a sea-fight one Inaros, after which they founded Naucratis. Now the only Inaros mentioned in history is the Libyan king, who about B.C. 460 tried to wrest Egypt from the Persians. But he was an ally, not an enemy of the Greeks, and in his days Miletus existed only in ruins; it is therefore certain that the Inaros whom the Milesians vanquished must have been a different ruler. As he does not appear in the Egyptian dynastic lists, we may be almost sure that he was a chief at the time of disintegration which preceded the final establishment of Psammitichus, when a multitude of petty potentates divided among them the land of the Pharaohs. Doubtless he was one of the rivals whom the Greek and Carian allies of Psammitichus put down for him. Far from thinking, with Mr. Petrie, that this passage of Strabo is to be set aside as useless, we regard it as the simplest and strongest testimony as to the date of the earliest Greek settlement in Egypt. If with Wiedemann we fix the accession of Psammitichus at B.C. 664, we shall regard the building of the Milesian fortress as having taken place before B.C. 670, and the first settlement of Naucratis as dating from about B.C. 660.

This is the time assigned by Herodotus and Strabo for the earliest intercourse between Egypt and Hellas. And that this was the beginning of Greek knowledge of the Nile country, is fully confirmed by all the archæological evidence which bears upon the matter, both the negative evidence and the positive.

When Egypt became accessible to Greek travellers, they crowded to behold its wonders, and we can easily understand how the vast size and venerable antiquity of the buildings of the Pharaohs would overpower the lively imaginations of the visitors, and how the fixity and order of Egyptian society would impress them. We moderns can see that a Greek in Memphis or Thebes as much represented a higher race and a nobler order of ideas, as a Spaniard in Mexico, or an Englishman in Canton. With him lay the future, with the Egyptians only the past; while they were sinking into decay, he was just starting on his great career as master for all time in science and art. But in the seventh century before our era this was not so clear as it is now. The Greeks called the Egyptians barbarians, but that term had not yet acquired the haughty meaning which filled it at a later date. So when the Egyptian priests dwelt on the antiquity of their civilization, and told the Greek travellers that

that in its presence they were like children before a venerable master, we cannot wonder that the strangers felt abashed. When Hecataeus of Miletus was rash enough to boast in the temple at Egyptian Thebes that his sixteenth ancestor was a god, the priests led him into an inner sanctuary, and showed him three hundred and forty-one statues of high-priests who had borne sway for life in successive generations, and told him that since that series began the gods had not walked the earth or begotten mortal men. Solon, wisest of the Greeks, is represented in the 'Timæus' of Plato as having been gently set down by an aged Egyptian priest: 'You Greeks, Solon, are ever boys, and there is no old man among you; you are young in mind, for you have no ancient belief handed down by long tradition, and no doctrine hoary with age.'

It is natural then that with minds thus cowed and overshadowed by the vast age of all they found in Egypt, the Greeks should have been ready to believe all that was told them by the priests as to the derivation of the Greek gods and Greek rites and customs from the land of the Pharaohs. Herodotus is entirely vanquished. 'The names of the gods came to Greece from Egypt.' 'The Egyptians were earliest among men in introducing religious assemblies and processions and set prayers, and the Greeks learned of them.' 'The customs I have mentioned and others which I shall mention hereafter the Greeks took from the Egyptians.' And later writers, such as Diodorus and Plutarch, speak in the same strain. They pass at once from a conviction of the greater antiquity of Egyptian civilization to a belief, that the Greeks must have borrowed from the people of Egypt those cults and those customs which were alike in the two peoples.

So long as the Egyptian language was unknown and the early history of the country lay in darkness, modern writers not unnaturally adopted this view; and the French savants, who accompanied to Egypt the army of Bonaparte, went with an eager expectation that they would find in the land of the Pyramids the source alike of the religions and of the civilization of antiquity. They hoped to find the origin not only of the laws of Solon, but also of those of Moses, and to prove that the earliest civilization in the world was also one of the wisest and most fruitful. It is hardly necessary to say that the reading of the hieroglyphic texts, combined with the progress of the historical sciences, has put an end to all such sanguine anticipations. We now know that, high as was the development of Egyptian civilization in certain directions, it was by no means the fertile mother of other civilizations; rather, like that of China, a complete
and

and fully developed growth, but not in the main line of human progress. All modern writers are agreed, that religious cults and national customs are exactly what the Greeks did not borrow from Egypt, any more than the Hebrews borrowed thence their religion or the Phœnicians their commerce. All are agreed that, before the reign of Psammitichus and the founding of Naucratis, Egypt was a sealed book to the Greeks.

Excavations such as those carried on in Greece, at Mycenæ and Menidi, fully confirm this opinion. At these places, amid the remains of prehistoric Greece, there has been found nothing to point to any useful intercourse between Egypt and Greece. A few objects have indeed been discovered, which, if not the work of Egyptian handicraftsmen, bear traces of their teaching; but archæologists, almost with one accord, agree to regard their presence on Greek sites as due to the commercial and manufacturing industry of the Phœnicians, and to consider the people of Tyre and Sidon as the sole mediators between the manufactories of Egypt and the shores of Greece in prehistoric times. It is likely that the Phœnicians, who were from time to time the subjects of the Pharaohs, were admitted, where aliens like the Greeks were excluded. We have indeed positive evidence that the Egyptians did not wish strange countries to learn their art, for in a treaty between them and the Hittites it is stipulated that neither country shall harbour fugitive artists from the other. But however the fact may be accounted for, it is an undoubted fact, that long before Psammitichus threw Egypt open to the foreigner, the Phœnicians had studied in the school of Egyptian art, and learned to copy all sorts of handiwork procured from the valley of the Nile. This is proved not only by the excavations in Greece, but by the results of Sir Henry Layard's investigations at Nimrud, where many Phœnician bowls of Egyptizing style were found in the north-west palace, as well as by the results of M. Renan's mission to Phœnicia.

What kind of an influence it was which, after the building of Naucratis, Egyptian civilization exercised upon Greek beliefs and laws and arts, we shall presently consider; for the present we will resume the thread of Egyptian history, which exhibits the other phase of the connection, the influence of Greek character and valour on the political fortunes of the valley of the Nile.

Psammitichus made his birthplace, Saïs, the capital of Egypt. All the country had greatly suffered in the wars with the fierce and brutal Assyrians, and the ancient capitals Memphis and Thebes were greatly reduced; but this was not the only reason for passing them by in favour of a site in the Delta. The fatal
step

step of calling in armed strangers compelled Psammitichus, after becoming king, still to lean on their support. He attracted to Egypt large bodies of Carian and Ionian mercenaries, and settled them at Daphnæ, on the Pelusian branch of the Nile, a spot well chosen as an outpost against possible invasion from Asia. Here the new-comers occupied fortified camps on both sides of the river. Herodotus says that the King entrusted to them certain Egyptian children to bring up, and that these became the parents of the entire caste of interpreters, who in the next age became the go-betweens between Greek and Egyptian. If the mercenaries came, as was probable, without wife or child, it is likely that Egyptian women were assigned to them, and that a large number of half-breeds arose, of whom a separate caste would naturally be formed by the exclusive and stranger-hating dwellers by the Nile: indeed we are inclined to interpret in this way the statement of Herodotus. Within the last few months Mr. Petrie has investigated Daphnæ, and found the site of the Greek camps, where weapons and horse-gear may still be found underground, together with a quantity of fragmentary early Greek pottery, in the neighbourhood of a palace proved by a cartouche found under the foundations to have been erected by Psammitichus.

As a patient in a dying state is sometimes revived by the infusion of the blood of one in vigorous health, so Egypt seems at once to have recovered some prosperity under the new ruler with his new allies. Temples of the gods arose, or were restored, on all sides, as we learn from many a dedicatory inscription still preserved. And it is interesting to find in the art of the Saïte kings a marked new impulse. At this period, writes Wiedemann, in sculptured figures 'the proportions of the body grow slimmer and more shapely, the muscles are worked out with greater naturalism. The features of the face, even the hair, shows a treatment careful in the smallest detail, and in the modelling of the ear and nose especially we may discern the industry and talent of the artists.' And the new impulse was not less visible in arms than in art. After securing Egypt from invasion, by fixing strong garrisons on its eastern, western, and southern borders, Psammitichus marched with his native army and his Greek allies into Syria. Ashdod was taken after a long siege, and inscriptions found at Aradus and Tyre prove that all Palestine fell at this time into the hands of the Pharaohs. But a still more powerful invader came from the north; the dreaded and destructive host of the Scythians poured down into Syria, burning and slaying like the Mongol hordes of later times. Psammitichus was fain to retire; he is said to have bought his safety

safety with money, and perhaps, but for his castle of Daphnæ, the plague of human locusts might have followed him to the banks of the Nile.

According to Herodotus and Diodorus, the favour shown to the Greeks by the King was the cause of a great revolt of the native Egyptian troops, who left the frontier-fortresses, and marched south beyond Elephantine, where they settled, resisting all the entreaties of Psammitichus, who naturally deplored the loss of the mainstay of his dominions, and developed into the race of the Sebridæ. Wiedemann, however, rejects the whole story as unhistorical, and certainly, if we closely consider it, it contains great inherent improbabilities. Even among a people naturally so unwarlike as the Egyptians, a great revolt of troops, and the march of an armed force from end to end of Egypt, could scarcely take place without some fighting.

Psammitichus died in B.C. 610, and was succeeded by his son Necho, who was his equal in enterprise and vigour. This King paid great attention to the fleet of Egypt, and Greek shipwrights were set to work on both the Mediterranean and Red Seas to build triremes for the State navy. A fleet of his ships, we are told, succeeded in sailing round Africa, a very great feat for the age. The King even attempted the task, of which the completion was reserved for the Persian Darius, the Ptolemies, and Trajan, of making a canal from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. Herodotus says that, after sacrificing the lives of 120,000 men to the labour and heat of the task, he gave it up, in consequence of the warning of an oracle that he was toiling only for the barbarians. It is an easy task with Wiedemann to suggest reasons for its abandonment of a more political and statesmanlike character, such as a wish to stop the waste of human life, or a fear which in such cases has at all periods of history terrified engineers, that the levels of the two seas might prove quite different, and that the waters might make a breach over the land. But, after all, we have no reason for assuming that a Pharaoh would always act from motives which we would approve, and the simplest plan is to take the story as it stands, perhaps with a grain of salt.

Necho, like his father, must needs try the edge of his new weapon, the Ionian mercenaries, on Asia. At first he was successful. Josiah, king of Judah, came out against him, but was slain, and his army dispersed. Greek valour carried Necho as far as the Euphrates, and in gratitude the King dedicated to Apollo in the temple of the Branchidæ at Miletus the linen cuirass which he wore. But Nebuchadnezzar, son of the King of Babylon, marched against the invaders, and defeated them
in

in a great battle near Carchemish. His father's death recalled him to Babylon, and Egypt was for the moment saved from counter-invasion by the stubborn resistance offered to the Babylonian arms by Jehoiakim, king of Judah, a resistance fatal to the Jewish race; for Jerusalem was captured after a long siege, and most of the inhabitants carried into captivity.

Of Psammitichus II., who succeeded Necho, we should know but little were it not for the archæological record. Herodotus only says that he attacked Ethiopia, and died after a reign of six years. But of the expedition thus summarily recorded we have a lasting and memorable result in the well-known inscriptions written by Rhodians and other Greek mercenaries on the legs of the Colossi at Abu Simbel in Nubia, which record how certain of them came thither in the reign of Psammitichus, pushing up the river in boats as far as it was navigable, that is perhaps, up to the second cataract. The importance of these inscriptions to the history of Greek epigraphy is well known; but their testimony had hitherto lost much of its force, because it could not be finally determined whether they belonged to the reign of the first or the second Psammitichus. Of late most scholars have agreed with Wiedemann in assigning them to the later monarch; and the excavations at Naucratis seem to prove definitely that this view is right. Mr. Ernest Gardner, who publishes with care and accuracy the numerous Greek inscriptions found at Naucratis, proves that many of them are of considerably earlier date than the inscriptions of Abu Simbel. As the earliest Naucratic inscriptions, however, cannot date from an earlier time than the reign of the first Psammitichus, when Naucratis was founded, it is certain that the Abu Simbel inscriptions must belong to the reign of the second king of that name.

Apries, the Hophra of the Bible, was the next king. The early part of his reign was marked by successful warfare against the Phœnicians and the peoples of Syria; but, like his predecessor, he was unable to maintain a footing in Asia in the face of the powerful and warlike Nebuchadnezzar. The hostility, which prevailed between Egypt and Babylon at this time, caused King Apries to open a refuge for those Jews who fled from the persecution of Nebuchadnezzar. He assigned to their leaders, among whom were the daughters of the King of Judah, a palace of his own at Daphnæ, Pharaoh's house at Tahpanhes, as it is called by Jeremiah. That prophet was among the fugitives, and uttered in the palace a notable prophecy (xliii. 9) that King Nebuchadnezzar should come and spread his conquering tent over its pavement. Formerly it was supposed that this prophecy

phesy remained unfulfilled, but this opinion has to be abandoned. Recently-discovered Egyptian and Babylonian inscriptions prove that Nebuchadnezzar conquered Egypt as far as Syene, at which point a certain general, named Hor, claims to have stopped his advance. Mr. Petrie, while investigating the site of Daphnæ, has found fresh evidence to the same effect. He has discovered the ruins of a royal palace built by Psammitichus I., which to this day, most curiously, bears the title of 'the house of the Jew's daughter;' ruins which by their condition prove that the palace was destroyed by a hostile invader, in all likelihood by the Babylonian monarch. He has even found the square pavement on which, according to the Prophet, Nebuchadnezzar should set up his tent. There are few people who do not feel, in the presence of facts like these, that our grasp of many scenes of ancient history is becoming stronger, and our outlook clearer.

The fall of Apries was brought about by his ingratitude to the Greeks, and his contempt for the lives of his own subjects. He had formed the project of bringing under his sway the Greek cities of the Cyrenaica, at that time in a most wealthy and flourishing condition, prospering under the rule of the Battiad princes, and drawing within the circle of Hellenic commerce all the nomadic nations of Northern Africa. Apries despatched against Cyrene a large force; but the Cyreneans bravely defended themselves, and as the Egyptians on this occasion marched without their Greek allies, they were entirely defeated, and most of them perished by the sword, or in the deserts which separate Cyrene from Egypt. The defeated troops, and their countrymen who remained behind in garrison in Egypt, imputed the disaster to treachery on the part of Apries, believing that he would willingly reduce the number of his Egyptian warriors in his partiality for their Greek allies. They revolted, and chose as their leader Amasis, a man of experience and daring. But Apries, though deserted by his subjects, hoped still to maintain his throne by Greek aid. At the head of thirty thousand Ionians and Carians he marched against Amasis. At Momemphis a battle took place between the rival kings and the rival nations; but the numbers of the Egyptians prevailed over the arms and discipline of the mercenaries, and Apries was defeated and captured by his rival, who, however, allowed him for some years to retain the name of joint-king.

It is the best possible proof of the solidity of Greek influence in Egypt at this time that Amasis, though set on the throne by the native army after a victory over the Greek mercenaries, yet did not expel these latter from Egypt, but, on the contrary,
raised

raised them to higher favour than before. The troops which had been settled at Daphnæ in the 'Camps,' he brought to Memphis to be his body-guard. Herodotus says, that it was Amasis who gave Naucratis to the Greeks to settle in; this is incorrect, since the inscriptions found at Naucratis prove beyond a doubt, that the city was in the possession of Greeks before the time of Psammitichus II.; but it may well be that Amasis accorded to the city special privileges, and laid the foundation of its great prosperity. Mr. Petrie's careful investigations enable us to conjecture what it was that Naucratis owed to the favour of Amasis,—the building of the Hellenion, of which we shall presently have to speak.

Amasis entered more fully than his predecessors into the stream of the history of the Levant. He conquered Cyprus and the cities of Phœnicia, and he won victories over the Arabs. He won by wisdom what Apries had vainly sought by arms, a predominant influence in Cyrene; and a fair daughter of that city became his queen. He gave fresh impulse to the cutting of canals and the extension of agriculture, and we are told that in his day there were in Egypt twenty thousand flourishing cities, a statement which seems to be an exaggeration. To him was ascribed the promulgation of the law, that every year each dweller in Egypt should report to the ruler of the district where he lived by what means he made a living, those who could make no satisfactory statement being condemned to death. Perhaps this is the earliest of recorded poor-laws, and it is certainly the most drastic; whether there was any relation between it and the flourishing condition of the country, we cannot venture to say.

In the delightful dawn of connected European history we see Amasis as a wise and wealthy prince, ruling in Egypt at the time when Polycrates was tyrant of Samos, and Cræsus of Lydia, the richest king of his time, was beginning to be alarmed by the rapid expansion of the Persian power under Cyrus. We hear of Pythagoras visiting him and obtaining letters from him to the priests of Egypt, which induced them to communicate to that earliest of mystics some of their choicest secrets. Thales was also a welcome guest at the court of Amasis. We need not repeat the story, familiar in these days to children, of the friendship between Amasis and Polycrates, and how Amasis broke off that friendship because he was convinced that some calamity impended over Polycrates. Wiedemann's version is that Amasis was afraid that he might be landed in difficulties, supposing that Polycrates should quarrel with his subjects; but we must confess that the German professor's explanation seems

to us uncomfortably modern, while the story of the ring of Polycrates suits admirably the whole mental and religious atmosphere of Greek antiquity. Critical historians are bound to make new theories in such a case; but the tale of Herodotus will outlive them all, and afford a starting-point for fresh theories a thousand years hence. The alliance of Amasis and Cræsus must in any case be taken as a historical fact, for there were Egyptian troops, perhaps we should rather say a body of Egypto-Greek mercenaries, in the Lydian army when Cyrus defeated it; the Persian king especially noticed their valour, and gave them lands for settlement in Asia Minor, where their descendants dwelt in later times.

In the days of Psammitichus III., the son of Amasis, the storm which had overshadowed Asia broke upon Egypt. One of the leaders of the Greek mercenaries in Egypt named Phanes, a native of Halicarnassus, made his way to the Persian Court, and persuaded Cambyses, who, according to the story, had received from Amasis one of those affronts which have so often produced wars between despots, to invade Egypt in full force. In a battle fought at Pelusium about B.C. 525, the Egyptians and their Greek allies were utterly defeated by the Persian king, and this one victory laid Egypt at his feet. As the Persian conquest is the beginning of quite a new era in Egyptian history, and as it closes the time of the greatest prosperity of Naucratis, we will at this point interrupt our sketch of Egyptian history, in order to trace the fortunes of that city during the reigns of the Philhellenic monarchs of the Saïte line.

On the subject of the position of Naucratis there is distinct and irreconcilable contradiction between Ptolemy and the map of Peutinger on one side and Strabo on the other. The two former authorities place the city to the left (looking down the stream) of the Canobic branch of the Nile, that is to say, outside the Delta enclosed by the Canobic and Pelusiatic branches; while Strabo as clearly places the city within the Delta and on the right of the Canobic branch. Most modern writers had followed Strabo; but certainty would never have been attained, but for the spade. That useful instrument has settled the controversy:—

‘It was by the merest accident,’ writes Mr. Petrie,* ‘that I got the clue to the site of Naukratis. An Arab at the Pyramids sold me an archaic Greek statuette, and, cross-questioning him, I heard of the place from which he had brought it. I visited the site as soon as I could, and found that the ground which the Arabs had cleared was strewn with pieces of early Greek pottery. When I went there to

* ‘Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1885,’ p. 15.

begin work this past season' (1884-5), 'I saw at the very house, where I obtained quarters, a decree of the city of Naukratis which had been found in the ruins; and it only needed the results of our excavations to turn a hopeful probability into a certainty.'

The site thus identified is at present on a canal to the west of the westernmost branch of the Nile; thus, by the logic of facts, Ptolemy is proved to be right and Strabo wrong.

On another point the correction of classical authorities is rather less conclusive. At present the site of Naukratis is on a canal which joins the Nile some miles off, while in many statements of ancient writers it seems to be implied that the city stood on the river itself. Mr. Petrie is at no loss for reasons why a canal would be a more satisfactory channel of communication with the outer world than a river.

'If Naukratis* had been on an open branch of the river, it would have been almost unapproachable during the three months of the inundation. And then these three months were the most valuable of all for trade; since then the natives had nothing to do, the whole land being under water, and at the same time they had all the proceeds of the harvest lying by in hand. This was then the great time for the Greek traders; and when the villages stood out of the water like the islands of the *Ægean*, as Herodotus describes them, the Greek pedlars were doubtless pushing their fortunes actively in shallow boats, sailing from village to village.'

Perhaps this argument, that a city on the Nile itself could not be approached during the inundation, must not be too much relied on, since almost all the cities of Egypt did stand on the Nile. And when Mr. Petrie goes on to cite Herodotus as a witness in favour of the position of Naukratis on a canal, he seems to us to misquote Herodotus. He writes, 'Herodotus expressly says that, when the Nile was in flood, they sailed up from Naukratis to Memphis by the canal which flowed past the Pyramids, owing to the stream of the river being too strong against them.' But what Herodotus really says (ii. 97) is quite different. 'At this season (of inundation) boats no longer keep the course of the river, but sail right across the plain. On the voyage from Naukratis to Memphis at this season, you pass close to the Pyramids, whereas the usual course is by the apex of the Delta.' But though we cannot agree with Mr. Petrie's reasoning, he has his fact. The site of Naukratis is now on a canal, and must have been so originally, unless the course of the Nile has changed, which is scarcely unlikely.

By a close attention to the stratification of the remains of

* 'Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1885,' p. 21.

Naucratis, Mr. Petrie has recovered for us the outlines of the history of the city. The lowest stratum of all is a bed of charcoal and ashes, which seems to be the result of a conflagration of a cluster of poor houses built in large part of wood. This village may have been the earliest settlement of the Greeks; but it seems to us equally probable that it may have been a native Egyptian village, or perhaps a settlement of Phœnicians, conquered and destroyed by the Milesians when they came to make a settlement in the land. The next stage of the history of Naucratis, corresponding almost to a certainty with the reign of Psammitichus I., has left us more distinct and solid memorials. Among these memorials must first be mentioned a large quantity of scarabs and moulds for scarabs, evidently the stock in trade of a maker of seals and amulets. Of these many bear the name of Psammitichus I., some those of Psammitichus II., and apparently of Apries. Here the series comes to an abrupt conclusion, and it would seem from the extent of the stock suddenly thrown away or buried, that the cessation of the factory must have been caused by some event which greatly disturbed the trade of Naucratis, perhaps, as Mr. Petrie suggests, the defeat of Apries' Greek mercenaries. We may observe in passing, that scarabs imitated from those of Egypt, and like those produced in the factory just mentioned, have been found in Rhodes, and on other Greek sites. They have always hitherto been supposed to be of Phœnician work, but in future archaeologists will be more inclined to regard them as imported from Naucratis.

To the same period as the factory of scarabs belongs the foundation of the earliest Greek temples of Naucratis. Of these several are mentioned in a well-known passage of Herodotus (ii. 178), who says that, beside the Hellenion, which belonged to the Greeks in common, the Æginetans founded a temple of Zeus, the Samians one of Hera, and the Milesians one of Apollo. An early temple of Aphrodite is also spoken of by Athenæus (xv. 18). Of these temples the Hellenion and the temple of Apollo were found by Mr. Petrie in 1885; the temples of Hera and Aphrodite have been discovered during the present year, when the excavations have been continued by Mr. Ernest Gardner. A temple dedicated to the Dioscuri has also been discovered. Of the Hellenion we shall presently have to speak. The other temples mostly show proofs of early foundation and subsequent refoundation; of the successive temples of Apollo, a few fragments, interesting in point of architectural detail, have been preserved. All the temples, however, are very small; if we compare them with contemporary temples of the

the West or of Asia Minor, with the magnificent structures of Pæstum or Agrigentum or of Ephesus, they will indeed seem mean. Their scale proves beyond question that we must not think of Naucratis, even when at the height of its fortunes, as of a great or wealthy city, but rather as of an emporium or trading-station, chiefly important as being the point at which the Greek and Egyptian civilizations met.

But time, which has destroyed all that was splendid in the temples of Naucratis, the marble pillars, the cultus-statues, the dedicated vessels of gold and silver, has made some amends by preserving to us their rubbish-heaps. It was the custom of the city, that Greeks who entered Egypt by that way, should dedicate to the patron deity, under whose protection they voyaged, a statuette or vessel of pottery in memory of a safe journey. On the object so dedicated they would inscribe the name of the donor. And as from time to time the temples became too full of these pious offerings, the temple officers would dig a trench and bury all that they judged to be superfluous, breaking them up for economy of space. Out of such trenches Mr. Petrie and Mr. Gardner have extracted thousands of fragments of pottery, painted with figures or inscribed with dedicatory formulæ, besides many statuettes, mostly fragmentary also. To build up these fragments into vases, nearly or partly complete, is a laborious task, which is now in progress; and of which the results can scarcely fail to be valuable. We shall acquire a long series of inscriptions for the epigraphist; and for the archæologist a quantity of vases, which can be dated by means of the inscriptions which they bear. And we shall acquire a sort of visitors' album, a record of the Greeks who went to Egypt, from the foundation of the city under Psammithus, down to the Persian conquest, when these dedicatory customs seem to have been discontinued. Mr. Gardner has already made public one name of no ordinary interest, which he has deciphered, that of Rhœcus, probably the same sculptor Rhœcus who was in antiquity spoken of as having worked in the Egyptian style, and who was at the same time, with his son Theodorus, one of the originators of the production in Greece of statues of divinities. In another case we seem to find the name of Sappho,* whose brother, if not herself, is known to have journeyed to Naucratis. On one large vessel we read the name of Phanes, the son of Glaucus, whom Mr. Gardner can scarcely be wrong in identifying with the Greek captain of mercenaries, who led Cambyses into Egypt.

* 'Naucratis,' p. 62, No. 532.

It is a point which never can be fully settled, how much Amasis did for the Greeks of Naucratis, and in what light he really regarded them. The two statements of Herodotus,—first, that he won his throne through Egyptian support and a victory over the Greeks; and secondly, that he was a great friend and patron of the Greeks,—seem at first sight to be discordant. Mr. Petrie endeavours with considerable ingenuity to reconcile them. He maintains that the abolition of other Greek settlements in Egypt, and the concession of a monopoly of Greek trade to Naucratis, was really an act fully as agreeable to the conservative inhabitants of Egypt as to the people of Naucratis themselves. It confined the Greek traders within definite limits, and prevented them from forming settlements in the great Egyptian cities, where their business activity, their love of innovation, their curiosity and talkativeness, would render them very unpleasant. We may be quite sure, however, that unless the Greeks had in some way had the best of the bargain, they would not have formed of Amasis the very favourable opinion which Herodotus repeats. The likelihood is, that the King, being a wise and liberal-minded man, saw that the goodwill of the foreigners was necessary to him, and behaved towards them in a generous spirit, at the same time conceding something to the exclusiveness of his native subjects.

With the reign of Amasis, Naucratis reached its highest point of commerce and renown. Herodotus says that he allowed the Greeks of Naucratis to dedicate precincts to various deities. It is a curious confirmation of this statement that, according to Mr. Petrie, while the foundations of the temple of Apollo date from somewhat after the middle of the seventh century, the outer wall of his precinct appears to have been built a century later. We also venture to think it probable, that the building of the Hellenion belongs to the reign of Amasis. This is not indeed stated by any ancient writer, nor can we prove it from the results of excavation; but it seems to be implied in what Herodotus says, and is in no way inconsistent with the testimony of the spade.

After enumerating the Greek cities which had a share in the foundation of the Hellenion, Herodotus adds, 'These are the states to which the enclosure belongs; and it is these states which appoint overseers of the market; other states which claim a share in it, claim that to which they have no right. The Æginetans, too, by themselves founded an enclosure of Zeus, the Samians of Hera, and the Milesians of Apollo.' It is thus evident that the Hellenion not only contained a temple or temples dedicated to the gods of Greece, but also an im-

portant market. This Hellenion Mr. Petrie has, almost beyond a doubt, discovered, and it fully bears out the description of Herodotus.

The enclosure consisted of a vast rectangle, some 250 yards square, bounded by a wall about 50 feet in thickness and in height, made of native brick. It contained two great buildings. Of these, one has entirely disappeared: the natives, who have in quite recent times destroyed it for the sake of its materials, state that it contained passages and rooms, with an entrance on the ground-floor, 'like a house in Cairo.' More than this we can never know about it; but we may conjecture, that it served rather for a dwelling-place than for temples of the gods. Of the other building there are abundant remains, and a most singular structure it must have been, but admirably adapted, like everything Greek, to the end which those who planned it had in view. It was in form a square, 60 yards each way, framed by walls 16 feet thick and about 60 high. The entrance was at 18 feet above the ground, evidently approached by a wooden scaffolding, which could be on occasion removed, and led into a passage, from which branched off to right and left twenty-six chambers. Under each of these chambers was a cellar, but the cellars did not communicate one with the other. There were also upper floors divided into chambers in similar fashion.

It is at once evident that we have in this building a great market and store-house. The deep cellars, each only accessible from the chamber above it, would furnish ample and secure space for storage; the rooms above would serve as show-rooms and offices, as well as workrooms. The whole would form a hive of industry much like a modern factory, full of looms and wheels, and the sound of iron and brass. Than the agora in ordinary Greek cities, nothing could be more open and simple. Outdoor life, with crowding and talking and sight-seeing, suited the restless and enquiring Greek. Yet here we see him living in a vast pile of building. And the reason is clear. In Hellas he felt himself to be surrounded by friends and fellow-citizens. Even on the coast of Scythia or Gaul or Libya, he had simple means for awing and pleasing his barbarous neighbours, so that their hostility soon ebbed away. But in Egypt he felt that he was surrounded by an alien race and a rival civilization; by a people who frankly despised instead of admiring him, and would be delighted at any opportunity to drive him into the sea. So he took precautions.

Close consideration of the factory shows it to have been admirably fitted for defence, whether against a crowd or an army.

army. There was no entrance save at 18 feet from the ground, the approach to which could easily be removed.

'If an enemy began to mine the wall, which was 16 feet thick, he would at last, on getting through it, find himself in the bottom of a well' (that is in one of the cellars), 'from which the besieged would have had ample time and notice to remove all means of communication. To mount a wall 18 feet high to a doorway, in the face of opponents above, would be impossible; or even the floors might be taken out and the doors fastened, so that the defenders could hurl down stones from a height of 50 feet or more on the enemy. The building was simply impregnable to direct attack, and has never been breached in this way.'

Nor would it be a hopeful task to try to reduce by famine a place so abounding in storage room for food and wine. And even before attempting either assault or blockade, the enemy would have to storm the outer wall of the great enclosure, 50 feet thick.

As we are now busy with the Hellenion, it may be well to sketch its history from the foundation onwards. It appears that at some time during the Persian rule part of the outer wall of the enclosure was broken down, when and how we know not. Ptolemy Philadelphus determined on its restoration. In the breach he set a large building, faced with limestone, no doubt for offices and for commerce. In connection with this building occurred some of the most interesting discoveries of the year. Mr. Petrie found that, exactly under each corner of it, had been buried a set of foundation deposits, which clearly marked the date and the character of the structure. In each deposit were models of the tools used for the building, and specimens of the materials employed in its construction; a model brick, a plaque of turquoise, jasper, agate, and obsidian; an ingot of gold, of silver, lead, copper, and iron; also models of ceremonial implements, libation vases, corn rubbers, a knife, and an axe, together with cartouches of Ptolemy himself. This discovery is not only charming in itself, but of great promise for the future, because it affords us hope of being able hereafter often to determine the date and character of Egyptian buildings, even when they have wholly disappeared, since it is likely that Ptolemy followed an old custom of the country in burying such record of his works.

In the Roman age the building of Ptolemy was pulled down, and its materials used for the erection of the houses and offices of Roman officials dwelling in the enclosure. But by that time Naucratis had gone far on the downward road leading from greatness to decay.

In all Greek cities, as is well known, there were two main

parts, the acropolis and the lower city. At Naucratis there was no hill whereon to build an acropolis; the Hellenion, with its mighty walls, took the place of a citadel and refuge in case of danger. At its gates lay the dwelling-houses of the city, its streets and docks. Of these houses and streets the plan has, to some extent, been discovered by Mr. Petrie. Though the site has been ruined and the whole ground carried away by the Arab diggers of sebach, yet by pains and study the lines of street can be followed, and the walls of the houses distinguished from the mud in which they are embedded. And these investigations prove that the city, at its best, was small and poor. The contrast between the chief Greek settlement in Egypt and the contemporary Greek settlements in Italy and Sicily, on the *Ægean* and the *Euxine*, is indeed marked, and calls for explanation.

Nor is the explanation far to seek. When the swarms thrown off by the parent cities of Greece landed in a country inhabited by Thracians or Phrygians, by wandering Libyan tribes or the rude but hardy races of South Italy, they came as a superior race, bringing with them at least the rudiments of arts and letters, as well as social order and habits of self-government. Those among whom they settled at once felt their superiority; and they had a proud consciousness of it themselves. They did not hesitate, even if they were few in number, to trace a great circuit for walls, and to set aside extensive precincts for their native deities. They knew that expanding Greece was behind them, and that their compatriots would flock after them across the sea. The peoples among whom they settled might sometimes harass them by force of arms, but had no arts, no civilization, no ideas, which could be set up against theirs. They were the force of light invading the kingdom of darkness, and the darkness fell away before them.

But in Egypt the Greeks before the rise of the Persian Empire met with a civilization which could dispute with them on equal terms. The Hellenic nationality being in its infancy was awed by the venerable institutions and beliefs of the land of the Nile. Instead of imparting to barbarians the rudiments of civil organization, the Greeks of Naucratis stood amazed in the presence of a society organized in the most inflexible way. Instead of teaching strangers the use of letters, they found themselves wondering at scribes who had two or three quite different ways of writing, according to the occasion and the subject. Instead of being able to tempt the cupidity of the natives by a display of works of archaic Greek art, they had to admire vessels and textile fabrics, images and ornaments, designed

designed with a skill which far surpassed their own, and showing a delicacy and pureness of style which roused their envy. Only in arms, elsewhere that in which they least excelled their barbarian neighbours, did the Greeks in Egypt surpass the natives of the country. Thus Naucratis might be compared to a tender plant growing in an uncongenial soil, and surrounded on all sides by hardier shrubs ever ready to encroach upon its narrow domain. When the fostering care of kings like Psammitichus and Amasis was no longer exercised, the decay of the city set in slowly but surely.

Meantime, while Naucratis flourished, it was as much an outlet for Egyptian as an inlet for Hellenic influences. Many of the wisest men of Greece in the seventh and sixth centuries, if we may believe the traditions accepted by their countrymen, passed through the city into Egypt, and brought away treasures of knowledge. According to Diodorus, Solon borrowed several laws from Egypt, among others the law that every citizen should once a year set forth before magistrates the sources of his livelihood. Pythagoras travelled with letters of introduction from Amasis himself, and was supposed to have learned in Egypt not only the language of the country, an acquirement in those days reckoned as wonderful, but also the principles of his mystic philosophy. Thales of Miletus is said by Diogenes Laertius to have learned mathematics and astronomy in Egypt, and to have taught his countrymen what he had thus learned himself. Hecataeus of Miletus, who perhaps deserves as much as Herodotus the title of 'father of history,' journeyed into Egypt, and told many tales of the country which remained among the common-places of Greek historical knowledge ever afterwards. No doubt when philosophy and science had grown in Greece to their full stature, they did not retain many marks of the swaddling-bands of Egypt; yet they may, as the ancients believed, have been very usefully aided in their infancy by those swaddling-bands.

There is, however, another field—the field of art and manufacture—in which the recent excavations should enable us to judge with some accuracy of the extent of the debt of Hellas to Egypt. No doubt they do supply us with materials for deciding this question; but the materials must be carefully considered in various lights, and during a series of years, before we can be quite sure how far their testimony reaches and what it teaches. It would be unwise to formulate ideas on the subject which may be unsound, and which must be premature, seeing that a large part of the antiquities from the site has not yet been exhibited. We will venture only on a few general remarks, justified by

by the plates of the volume before us. The products of Greek art from Naucratis, so far as published, consist chiefly of three classes of objects—scarabs, pottery, and statuettes. The scarabs come from the factory of which we have already spoken. Had they been found scattered over the Greek islands, or in Cyprus, they would have been at once taken for works of Phœnician craftsmen. For we do not usually think of the Greeks as making copies, barbarous copies, as archæologists term them, of the products of other peoples. But in that very early period the proud artistic consciousness of the Greeks had not developed, and they were not yet ashamed of making commodities which were in demand, even though the work of fashioning them was ignominious. And even in the common-place products of this factory we find now and then a trace of Greek originality and skill in design. The pottery from the site belongs nearly all to the seventh and sixth centuries. The bulk of it belongs to the class so abundantly found in the tombs of Cameirus in Rhodes, on which are painted friezes and heraldic groups of animals or winged monsters, lions, sphinxes, and boars, water-birds, and domestic fowls. Here, again, we have much that is Oriental, little that is Greek, and the pottery of Cameirus has usually been supposed to be of Phœnician origin. In certain other vases, however, which resemble the class which has hitherto been attributed to Cyrene, we find human figures, and more of human interest. But the conspectus of the early pottery, which can be dated, it must be remembered, by the dedicatory inscriptions which it bears, proves that even late in the sixth century the pottery of the Greeks had not emerged from that merely decorative stage in which much regard was paid to colour and the harmonious filling of space, and but little to form and subject. The result appears to show that our dates for early Greek ware are at present placed too far back, and need revision. The statuettes of Naucratis are seldom or never of purely Egyptian type; rather they are of the mixed character which we observe in statues and statuettes from the island of Cyprus. They too are not beautiful, and show little of the great wave of artistic inventiveness which was at the time passing over Greece. Of course we must wait until the archæologists have had time to examine and exhaust the evidence of the antiquities brought from Naucratis; but the first glance warns us not to expect too much in proof of artistic connection between Egypt and Greece.

When the military power of Persia became dominant in Egypt, the function of the Greek mercenaries was for a time gone, and their influence diminished. And it was by no means unlikely

unlikely that Egypt, which had long been suffering from physical exhaustion of the warrior caste, and long been used to respect foreign arms as irresistible, might have been content to accept Persian sway and pay tribute without a murmur, had the Persians been wise enough to spare the feelings and respect the institutions of the people. But this they did not do. They were usually very tolerant of the religions of those they conquered. Babylon and Asia Minor had little ground for accusing them of the fervid iconoclasm which some writers have supposed to be part of their policy. And in Egypt, at the first conquest of the country, they seem to have spared the political and religious sensibilities of the people. We possess a record drawn up by an Egyptian, who narrates how he initiated Cambyses in the mysteries of Neith, and obtained of the king for the goddess special favours, and for himself the post of Court-physician. But afterwards, a sort of frenzy seems to have fallen on Cambyses. He is said not only to have dug up and ill-used the corpse of Amasis, who died during the Persian invasion, but to have treated his family with insult and cruelty. From persecution of the kings of Egypt he passed to persecution of the gods of the country. Every one knows the story told by Herodotus, how, when full of irritation at the news of the destruction of the troops he had sent against the Libyan Oasis, Cambyses was driven to madness by the sound of joy and revelry in the streets of Memphis; and how, learning that the cause of the rejoicing was the installment of a new Apis-bull, he sent for the new-made deity and plunged a knife into its side, so that it languished and died. It is curious that Wiedemann, who usually rejects stories of this kind, is willing to accept this tale, because he believes that he can identify among the tablets set up in honour of successive Apis-bulls in the Serapeum at Memphis, the record of the animal slain by Cambyses, a record graven in haste and wanting in the usual formalities. We also learn that Cambyses wasted with fire and sword many of the temples of Egypt, and carried off their treasures to Persia.

In such deeds of impiety the Egyptian priests naturally found the cause of the madness which possessed Cambyses in his later years, and made him a terror to all about him. Herodotus is quite ready to accept the explanation. The conduct of Darius Hystaspes was very different from that of Cambyses; he buried with great pomp an Apis-bull which died during his reign, and took great pains to find him a successor; he built and restored many temples, endowed colleges of scribes which were impoverished, and is represented to us in tradition as maintaining an easy and friendly intercourse with the Egyptian priests.

priests. But there were few Persian rulers like Darius; the Persian yoke was on the whole extremely uncongenial to the dwellers by the Nile, and wounded all their most settled sentiments. It was not long before discontent broke into open revolt; and during part of the fifth and most of the fourth century there were in Egypt native kings who enjoyed a degree of independence, were indeed often quite independent. Egypt was not really reduced to a Persian province until B.C. 350, a few years before the conquest of the country by Alexander the Great.

We do not propose to trace the obscure outlines of the history of Egypt during this period of revolt and struggle. But it is part of our task to sketch the course taken by events when the Greeks organized, as they did more than once, expeditions to aid the native Egyptian rulers in their efforts to be independent. Between the invasion of Greece by Xerxes and the invasion of Persia by Alexander, there was a perpetual enmity, whether flaming or smouldering, between the Hellenic race and the over-lords of Asia; and the ruling States in Greece were constantly on the alert to strike at any part of the Persian dominions which might seem open to attack.

Soon after the accession of Artaxerxes to the Persian throne in B.C. 464, a revolt broke out in Egypt. The leader was not a native Egyptian, but a Libyan, Inaros by name. Our surprise at this circumstance diminishes if we consider that for ages, from the fifteenth century onwards, Libyan or Mediterranean mercenaries had been a chief element in the armies of Egypt; it was therefore natural that the Egyptians in any attempt to expel the Persians should call on their allies for help. They called also on the people of Athens, with whom the destruction of their city by Xerxes was a fresh memory, and they did not appeal in vain. There were two hundred Athenian triremes stationed at Cyprus, ready for any service against Persia; these were at once ordered to the Nile. They conquered the Delta and two-thirds of Memphis, hemming the Persian troops into the citadel called the White Fortress. Achæmenes, the Persian satrap, came with an army and fleet to the relief of his men; but his army was defeated with great slaughter by Inaros, and his fleet by the Athenian triremes; he himself was among the slain. But a new and enormous armament was despatched from Persia under the command of Megabyzus, comprising, we are told, at least half a million of men. The Libyans and Athenians had to retire from Memphis, and took refuge in the island Prosopitis. For a year and a half their naval superiority enabled them to maintain themselves there; then the Persians succeeded in turning aside the water from the branch of the Nile which enclosed

enclosed the island. Inaros was captured and cruelly executed; the Athenians capitulated, but were allowed to depart, and marched through Libya to Cyrene, leaving the ships to their conqueror. A reinforcement of fifty Athenian triremes ascending the Mendesian arm of the Nile, in ignorance of what had happened, was entrapped by the Persians and destroyed.

The death of Inaros and the defeat of the Greeks did not at once bring the revolt to an end. Amyrtæus, a native Egyptian, found means to carry on the struggle for some time longer. Cimon, then in command of the Athenian fleet near Cyprus, sent him sixty ships as an aid. But they accomplished nothing, and soon retired. That Amyrtæus was able to make favourable terms for himself with the Persian king, appears from the statement of Herodotus, that the Persians allowed Pausiris, son of Amyrtæus, to retain his father's dominion, though he probably retained it not as an independent sovereign but as a vassal of Persia.

A later revolt of Egypt about B.C. 415 was more successful; and for sixty-four years that country maintained a precarious independence under the 28th, 29th, and 30th dynasties. This was accomplished only by the aid of Greek mercenaries, who henceforward play the leading part in all wars on the shores of the Ægean. But to give a connected narrative of their doings in Egypt is very difficult, if not impossible. We lose the guidance of Thucydides, and have to choose between the discrepant accounts of writers like Diodorus, Plutarch, and Cornelius Nepos. The most abundant information comes from the slovenly pen of Diodorus. Of late certain Egyptologists, more particularly Wiedemann and Revillout, have tried to restore the reputation of this writer. They have succeeded in showing that his account of Egyptian law is based on good and native authorities; but even Wiedemann does not pretend that his narratives of events are to be trusted. He confuses names and dates with the most exasperating carelessness, and in repeating his account of civil and military events we cannot escape from the feeling, that it is likely that what he is narrating never really happened. Unfortunately also at this period native records are scarce and meagre. The materials of history, therefore, scarcely exist.

The native ruler who shook off the Persian yoke was Amyrtæus, perhaps a grandson of the Amyrtæus already spoken of. He gained possession alike of Upper and Lower Egypt, and it seems from a casual reference in Thucydides (viii. 35), that he was a friend of the Athenians. That he won his throne through Greek mercenaries is more than probable, and when a papyrus informs

informs us in regard to his successors, that they owed their elevation to the soldiers, we may be almost sure that the nucleus of these soldiers was Greek. Of Achoris, who ruled at the beginning of the fourth century, we learn that he sent building-timber and corn to the Spartans for their wars, and that he concluded with the active and powerful Evagoras, king of Cyprus, a treaty against Persia, and sent fifty vessels to his aid in that final battle against the Great King, which put an end for ever to the chance of Cyprus gaining a prominent place in the world's history.

As to the wars and policy of the next King, Nectanebus I., who came to the throne, according to Wiedemann, in B.C. 387, we have ampler information. Evagoras having been put down, the Persians made great preparations for the reduction of Egypt. Pharnabazus marched into the country with an army of 200,000 men, but even with forces so overwhelming he was disquieted by hearing that the Athenian Chabrias was in the Egyptian service. Sending to Athens, he procured the recall of that officer, and even persuaded the Athenians to let him have the services of Iphicrates, who joined him with 20,000 Greek mercenaries. Failing in an attempt on the Pelusian arm of the Nile, Pharnabazus and Iphicrates made good an entry into Egypt by the Mendesian arm. The land lay open to them, and Iphicrates counselled (we repeat the account of Diodorus) a prompt attack upon Memphis, which was not in a state of defence. But whether through jealousy or indecision, or through waiting for orders from the Persian court, Pharnabazus delayed to move until Nectanebus had had time to cover Memphis with his army, and the rising of the Nile so hampered the movements of the Persians that they were obliged to retire, and the invasion came to nothing. The reign of Nectanebus was dignified by visits paid to Egypt by noteworthy Greek savants: Eudoxus, the astronomer; Chrysippus, the physician; and Plato, the philosopher. Letters of introduction from Agesilaus secured Eudoxus respectful attention at the Egyptian court. As regards one of the three, Plato, we may be sure that his imagination was not unmoved by the wonders of the land, and that there are passages in his writings which but for this visit would not have been written.

The successor of Nectanebus, Tachos, being again threatened from Persia, applied for aid to the Spartans, and procured for himself, it is said through heavy bribes, the aid of the aged Agesilaus and a body of Lacedæmonian troops. Being thus fortunate, and having further secured the Athenian Chabrias as leader of his fleet, he felt emboldened to undertake an offensive campaign.

campaign. He rapidly made a conquest of Phœnicia; but during his absence a relation, Nectanebus II., revolted against him. The people of Egypt seem at once to have accepted the new pretender, but the question was what line would be taken by Agesilaus and Chabrias. Agesilaus had already been deeply wounded in his Spartan pride by Tachos, who had failed to understand, that the coarse clothes and rude manners of the Spartan king were a sign not of humility but of infinite pretension, and had ventured to slight him. He is said to have referred to Sparta the question which side he should take, and to have received in reply the answer, that he should do whatever was for the advantage of Sparta. He left the party of Tachos and adopted that of Nectanebus; Chabrias followed his example; and Tachos' Egyptian troops not venturing to retain their loyalty, he fled to the Persian court, where he was received as a useful ally.

We hear next of a fresh Persian invasion of Egypt, which was repulsed by two Greek leaders of mercenaries, Diophantus of Athens and Lamius of Sparta. But a subsequent expedition, which took place in the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus about B.C. 350, was more successful. The manner of its success is very characteristic of the times. The Persian army of invasion was accompanied by a large body of Greek troops under Nicostratus and Mentor of Rhodes. Nectanebus marched against it, accompanied by 20,000 Greek troops under Cleinias of Cos. On the frontier the two bodies of mercenary troops came into collision, and Cleinias was defeated. The disaster was irreparable; Nectanebus fled to the south, and the cities of Egypt surrendered without further struggle. The Persian King Ochus visited Egypt, and is said to have repeated all the cruelties and enormities of Cambyzes, down to the slaying of the Apis bull; though it may perhaps be doubted whether the fact is that Ochus copied Cambyzes, or merely that Plutarch and other late writers who record these deeds copy Herodotus. In any case this was the end of Egyptian independence, and the historian must allow that the end was due. A nation, that could allow its national existence to depend on the victory or defeat of one body of foreign gladiators by another, can scarcely claim our pity when it fell. Egypt had still a history before it; but it was a history not concerned with conquest or war, but with science and poetry, religion and philosophy. But before the first page of that later history could be opened, it was necessary that Greek influence should affect far more deeply the national life. Hitherto Greeks had been only the defenders and mercenaries of Egypt; it was necessary that they

they should become her masters; and not masters only of her political organization, but also of her learning, her science, her religion, and her art.

Persian authority had scarcely been re-established in Egypt, when Persia in turn succumbed to a new and mighty foe. Alexander the Great, having welded into one force the wisdom of Greece and the hardy strength of Macedonia, brought that force to bear with irresistible energy on the languid and overgrown empire of Asia, and it crumbled at once to pieces. In no country was the victory of Alexander more rapid or more easy than in Egypt. City after city opened its gates on his approach; and the throne of the Pharaohs cost him scarcely the life of a spearman. Of course to forces and talents such as those of which Alexander disposed, Egypt could under any circumstances have made but a weak resistance. But there is reason to believe that she did not care to resist. Sabaces, the Persian satrap of the country, had fallen at Issus, and the Persian garrison was withdrawn to meet the nearer needs of the Empire. The Egyptians had no motive for resisting Alexander on behalf of their foreign masters, and they were too weak and dispirited to oppose him in the interests of their independence. Rather they were inclined to welcome him as a liberator, as a hero belonging to another and more tolerant race than the lords whom they were used to obey. Alexander offered sacrifices to the national deities, and amused the people with warlike pomp and agonistic festivals. The Egyptian priests were ready with a fiction to make submission in some sense a duty. Nectanebus II. had disappeared at the time of the Persian reconquest; the priests gave out that he had made his way to Macedon, and there, through the use of magic arts, become the father of Alexander. The story was an invention, as obviously false as the earlier fable which had made Cambyzes daughter of an Egyptian princess; in both cases the motive was the same, and in both cases the story fulfilled its object.

Escorted by his troops, Alexander sailed from Memphis by the Canobic branch of the Nile; he landed at Racotis. Here was the place where Homer represents the imaginary raid of Odysseus into Egypt as having taken place, in a poem which Alexander knew by heart. He at once made up his mind to build there a great city to bear his name, and to be a memorial of him for ever; and thus the greatest of all the Alexandrias came into being. Hence he visited the oasis of Ammon, led to the spot, when the way was lost in the sand, by two serpents; and found in that deity a third claimant to the honour of having begotten him.

As

As Alexandria grew, Naucratis declined. In the troubled times of the Nectanebi the city had rather shrunk than increased, and had suffered from some hostile violence, of which traces still remain. Despite the efforts of Ptolemy Philadelphus to restore the place, it never again flourished. A fragmentary papyrus proves that it retained under the Greek kings its municipal organization, under magistrates called *τιμούχοι*, remaining a free Greek community. About the third century of our era, after giving a home to some notable men of letters, —Philistus, Proclus, Athenæus, and Julius Pollux—Naucratis ceased to exist. Since then the site, one of the coolest, healthiest, and pleasantest in Egypt, has been tenanted by none but scattered Copts and companies of agricultural Arabs.

Egypt was indeed fortunate in being assigned, when Alexander's flimsy empire fell to pieces, to Ptolemy, son of Lagus, the gentlest and wisest of the Macedonian generals, a man who understood, while bringing fresh life into the administration, the religion, and the social condition of Egypt, how to avoid shocking the sensibilities of the conservative people of the land.

In religion, we find under the Ptolemaic kings a process of syncretism. The resemblance, which had not escaped Herodotus, of the worship of Isis to that of the Greek Demeter, made it easy that she should retain her place at the head of the pantheon of Egypt. But her consort Osiris gradually recedes into the background before a new deity, Serapis, whose worship was introduced into the country by Ptolemy in consequence of a dream. Serapis took his place beside Isis, and the other Egyptian gods, Anubis, Harpocrates, and the like, sank into mere satellites of the supreme pair, into whose worship more and more of symbolism and of mysticism entered, until the Egyptian religion seemed to the pagans of the third century of our era no unworthy rival of Christianity. But the state religion of Egypt in Hellenistic times was less the cult of Isis and Serapis than that of the kingly race. According to the tales of the priests, all the gods of Egypt, from Osiris downwards, had been originally successive kings of the country; it was therefore not difficult, especially since the Libyan Ammon guaranteed Alexander's divine parentage, to raise him also from the rank of king to that of god. The worship of the Macedonian hero and his Greek successors became the central worship of Egypt, and not only united Macedonian, Greek, and Egyptian in a common litany, but served to give religious sanction to the power of the reigning dynasty.

As kings, the Ptolemies stepped into the customs and the honours

honours of the Pharaohs. This was natural, since among the Greeks there was no precedent for such relations as existed in the East between sovereigns and subjects. Alexander did indeed for a short time assume the position of a Persian king of kings, and in some part of the station which he thus claimed most of his successors tried to imitate him. But probably the precedents of the Persian court had less effect in Egypt than in Syria or even Macedon. Of course the relation of the king to his Greek subjects and to his Egyptian subjects would not be the same. To the former he would be a countryman in high station; to the latter, an earthly god. From the facts of archæology we may illustrate this distinction. When on the walls of an Egyptian temple one of the Ptolemaic dynasty is depicted as engaged in religious or political observance, he is represented, as were the older monarchs of the land, in Egyptian dress, in conventional attitude, with the inexpressive features of an abstraction, not of a person. When on their silver coins, struck for the use of Greek commerce, the portraits of the Ptolemies appear, they appear as men, idealized indeed to some degree, but still as men, liable to the accidents and diseases of humanity. On the bronze coins struck under Ptolemaic rule, mostly for the use of the Egyptians themselves, we have usually no portrait at all, but the effigy of a deity.

Something, however, was changed even in the government of the native Egyptian population. Writers on the Ptolemaic constitution of Egypt attach great importance to the establishment of Boards of Judges who moved in circuit into the different districts of Egypt. Hitherto the Courts of Justice had had their fixed seats in the great cities; and the peasantry being, like all peasant cultivators, very litigious, had flocked into the towns with their causes, and waited for long periods until they could be attended to. We are told that the result was that much of the fertile land of Egypt remained for considerable periods untilled. Instead of abolishing the local courts, the Ptolemaic kings strove in some degree to supersede them by providing Boards of *Chrematistæ*, who moved among the people, vested directly by the King with a portion of his authority, and responsible to him alone. Thus cheaper and speedier justice was made accessible to the peasantry. But in Ptolemaic as in Pharaonic Egypt, the King was practically an autocrat, whose rescripts were law, and whose officers held power not a moment longer than they retained his favour. In Ptolemaic as in Pharaonic Egypt, the nome or district was the unit of government; probably the hierarchy of officials in the nome was not much altered.

But

But although the political constitution of Egypt was not greatly altered when the land fell into Greek hands, yet in many respects great changes took place. The mere fact, that Egypt took its place among a family of Hellenistic nations, instead of claiming as of old a proud isolation, must have had a great effect on the trade, the manufactures, and the customs of the country. To begin with trade. Under the native kings Egypt had scarcely any external trade, and trade could scarcely spring up during the wars with Persia. But under the Ptolemies, intercourse between Egypt and Sicily, Syria, or Greece, would naturally and necessarily rapidly advance. Egypt produced manufactured goods which were everywhere in demand: fine linen, ivory, porcelain, notably that papyrus, which Egypt alone produced and which was necessary to the growing trade in manuscripts. Artificial barriers being once removed, enterprising traders of Corinth and Tarentum, Ephesus and Rhodes, would naturally seek these goods in Egypt, bringing in return whatever of most attractive their own countries had to offer. It seems probable that the subjects of the Ptolemies seldom or never had the courage to sail direct down the Red Sea to India. In Roman times this voyage became not unusual, but at an earlier time the Indian trade was principally in the hands of the Arabs of Yemen and of the Persian Gulf. Nevertheless the commerce of Egypt under the Ptolemies spread eastwards as well as westwards. The important towns of Arsinoë and Berenice arose on the Red Sea as emporia of the Arabian trade. And as always happens when Egypt is in vigorous hands, the limits of Egyptian rule and commerce were pushed further and further up the Nile.

The influx into Alexandria and Memphis of a crowd of Greek architects, artists, and artisans, could not fail to produce movement in that stream of art which had in Egypt long remained all but stagnant. A wealthy Greek court and self-indulgent Greek satraps had to be supplied with articles of luxury, which would not offend them by hieratic stiffness or bear the impress of a religion which they half despised. That the Egyptians responded to the demand we know; the best proof is to be found in reading the extraordinary account in Athenæus of the pomp of Ptolemy Philadelphus. We there not merely hear of a display of wealth such as was perhaps never rivalled, of mountains of gold and silver, but also find precious indications of a new departure in Greek art, which seems on that occasion to have borrowed something from the abstract tendencies of Egyptian thought. There were statues not merely of gods and kings, but of a multitude of cities, and even personifications of qualities such as Aretê, valour, and of spaces of time such as the year

year and pentetêris. Such abstractions are not to be found in Greek art in its best period, nor are they in the spirit of Greek art at all; but they mark the new age and the progressive amalgamation of Greek and Egyptian nationalities and ideas under the just and benign rule of the earlier Ptolemies.

If we may trust the somewhat over-coloured and flighty panegyrics which have come down to us, the material progress of Egypt under Ptolemy Philadelphus was most wonderful. We read, though we cannot for a moment trust the figures of Appian, that in his reign Egypt possessed an army of 200,000 foot soldiers and 40,000 horsemen, 300 elephants and 2000 chariots of war. The fleet at the same period is said to have included 1500 large vessels, some of them with twenty or thirty banks of oars. Allowing for exaggeration, we must suppose that Egypt was then more powerful than it had been since the days of Rameses. The number of towns in Egypt under the early Ptolemies is given by some writers as over 30,000.

But far more noble, and far more durable in its effects than any mere material expansion, was the rise at Alexandria of a great literary and scientific school. Among the scholiasts on the great poets and prose-writers of Greece there was no doubt much pedantry, but a literature which was adorned by the writings of Theocritus, and Bion, and Callimachus, cannot be despised. And to our days all children are trained to mental accuracy by the writings of an Alexandrian professor of mathematics, Euclid. A large part of the thoughts which dominate the world's views in philosophy, religion, and science, saw the light first in Alexandria. But if it were our intention to do justice to the glories of that illustrious city, it would claim not the last page of an article, but a volume.

We have introduced the Greeks as they made their first appearance in Egypt as mail-clad warriors from over the sea, and we have followed their career until from being the hired protectors of the Egyptians, they became their masters. The later relations between Egypt on the one side, and Syria, Athens, and Rome on the other, would form a subject not less interesting, but beyond our compass. Egypt, with Alexandria as its capital, plays a great part in the drama of history; Egypt, with Naucratis as its link with the outer world, can form only a dim background to the splendour of the later fame of the country. It is therefore the more welcome, when excavation helps us to clear away some of the mist, which envelopes the earliest of the Greek settlements in Egypt, and enables us more clearly to understand under what conditions it existed and what were its relations to Greece and to Egypt.

ART. IV.—1. *The Pictorial Arts of Japan.* By William Anderson, F.R.C.S. London, 1886.

2. *Descriptive and Historical Catalogue of a Collection of Chinese and Japanese Pictures in the British Museum. Published by order of the Trustees.* By William Anderson, F.R.C.S. London, 1886.

3. *The Ornamental Arts of Japan.* By George Ashdown Audsley. London, 1886.

UP to the present time we have scarcely learned to regard Japanese painting in a serious light; yet, as a survival of the ancient but now almost extinct art of China, and as a memorial of the æsthetic tendencies of the larger section of the Turanian race, the subject is not only one of much archæological and anthropological interest, but it contains much that will delight and something that will instruct connoisseurs of all countries. The ornamental arts of Japan in general have been gorgeously and profusely illustrated in the splendid work of Mr. Audsley, mentioned above; the writings of Franks, Bing, and Brinkley, have given us perhaps all that it is important to know in connection with Japanese ceramics, and we have had abundant opportunities of studying the glyptic abilities of the people through Mr. Gonse's work, 'L'Art Japonais,' and more directly in the exquisite workmanship of the toggles and sword-guards accumulated by the collectors of our own country and of France. It is but yesterday, however, that the student grasped the fact, that the 'Land of the Reedy Moors' possessed its schools of painting, and its great masters of the brush, at a period when Europe was in a state of pictorial barbarism. The earliest information published in any Western language upon this subject came from a countryman of our own, Mr. William Anderson, formerly Medical Officer to the British Legation in Tokio, who published a paper in the 'Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan' for 1878, in which he traced the history of the art, through the Coreans and Chinese, to its latest development under the naturalists and industrial draughtsmen of the present century. Three years later, M. Louis Gonse devoted one of the sections of his beautiful work to a second outline, based on notes supplied by a well-known native expert, M. Wakai, but did not add materially to the facts already ascertained by the personal researches of his predecessor. During this time Mr. Anderson was placing in form his more matured knowledge, and he has now given us in his catalogue of the collection of Japanese pictures in the British Museum, and his magnificent work upon the Pictorial Arts of Japan, a

Vol. 164.—No. 327. H comprehensive

comprehensive review of the whole subject, historical, critical, and technical, with an examination of the principal motives illustrated by the painter, and a sketch, also the first of its kind, of the parent art of China. No one who examines this work of Mr. Anderson's, and that of Mr. Audsley, already referred to, in the most superficial way, can fail to be struck by the reflection, that the British public are not, after all, the stingy patrons of art that they are frequently represented to be. These two books have had lavished on them all the skill, ingenuity, and artistic taste of papermaker, printer, binder, and copyist; we cannot indeed call to mind at this moment more than one or two recent works which exhibit these in anything like the same degree; they deal with the art of a very distant country, and yet it is to be presumed that they would not be issued on this scale, or at all, unless in the opinion of competent persons there was a remunerative market for them in the United Kingdom. However this may be, they are volumes which reflect great credit on English publishing enterprise, and it is to be hoped that they will meet with that public favour which, having regard merely to the artistic merits of their external appearance and illustrations, they richly deserve. Of the literary contents of Mr. Anderson's book we shall now proceed to speak.

The fundamental characteristic in the history of Japanese painting, now clearly demonstrated, is that the art was avowedly Chinese in its origin, imported together with the literature and laws of the Middle Kingdom and the religion of Sakyamuni, by Buddhist missionaries from China and the Corean peninsula. What the condition of Japanese art may have been before the commencement of intercourse with the adjacent continent, we cannot tell, for the oldest written documents extant belong to a period no more remote than the eighth century of our era. Mr. Chamberlain's examination of the *Kojiki*, a mythico-historical account of Japan, shows that the conditions, habits, and acquirements of the Japanese before the advent of Chinese civilization, were those of savage races, and there is no reason to believe that their artistic development was in advance of their general culture. We do not know, even approximately, the date at which a close intercommunication was established with the outer world. Mr. Chamberlain is disposed to assign the earliest use of the Chinese written characters in Japan to the beginning of the fifth century of our era, the period at which the more obvious errors of Japanese chronology cease to appear, and we are left to conjecture as to the duration of the interval between the commencement of relations with a highly civilized people and the adoption of an aid to progress so essential

essential as the art of writing. It is at least certain that during the fifth century, corresponding to the earlier portions of the Northern Wei dynasty in China, the communications of Japan with the latter and with Corea were frequent and intimate. The Japanese at this time had commenced to absorb with avidity the flood of knowledge poured upon them from the abundant stores of their neighbours. The laws, literature, philosophy, arts, and religious beliefs of the Chinese were adopted *en bloc*; colleges for the dissemination of the new learning were liberally endowed; grand Buddhist temples, for the most part the work of Corean and Chinese architects, sprang up in profusion; the dress and ceremonials of China, as those of Europe at the present day, rapidly replaced the original order of things; and the language became inextricably interwoven with Chinese elements. Even in the legends and traditions that represent the early history of their country, the Japanese have so extensively incorporated the fictions of the older nations, as to give rise to an infinity of doubt and perplexity in the minds of students of the ancient history of the Far East. All the knowledge that China (then at the zenith of her intellectual power) had acquired in the long centuries of her development appears to have been placed without reserve, either directly or through the Coreans, at the disposal of Japan, and the high quality of the artistic teaching may be judged by the invaluable relics that still remain amongst the treasures of Nara and Kioto.

In art, the examples which inspired the early efforts of the Japanese were models which, in certain directions, the pupils have rarely reached and have never surpassed. The magnificent pair of wood-carvings figured on Plate I. of Mr. Anderson's book, which are attributed to a Corean sculptor of about 600 A.D., are startling in the vigour of their conception and in the absolutely realistic treatment of the anatomical details. The Buddhist mural decoration of the Hall of Horiuji, said to be the work of a Corean priest, and belonging to nearly the same period, exhibits a power of design, a sense of colour-harmony, and an acquaintance with the laws of composition that would do no injustice to the masters who, centuries later, gave life to the art of Italy. There are several other relics of equal antiquity, but of less certain origin, that speak wonders for the opportunities afforded to the Japanese for self-culture in the highest branches of art. With such treasures as these produced under their eyes, and with free access to the works of the great Chinese painters at a period when Chinese pictorial art stood unrivalled, it is not wonderful that the Japanese

developed the remarkable faculties which are now beginning to awaken so much surprise and admiration in Europe. But we cannot help feeling astonishment that nations like Corea and China, which could spare so much out of their abundance to aid in the development of an alien people, have allowed themselves in this respect to drop behind so miserably in the world's race.

A word on the history of Chinese pictorial art will not be out of place here. It is curious that not a single work upon China makes any reference whatever to a subject which offers so many attractions to the investigator. All that we know about it at the present time is derived from the materials collected by Mr. Anderson in Japan, which country, curiously enough, is probably richer in carefully-preserved specimens of this art than is the Middle Kingdom itself. It does not appear, so far as our still scanty information extends, that painting in China can boast an antiquity likely to command the respect of an Egyptologist. That drawing of some sort has existed as long as writing—and the use of written characters must have been known to the Chinese at least four thousand years ago—may be readily assumed, but the writers have preserved no record of painting until a date so far within the range of familiar historical periods as the third century of our era. The first artist to whose name and works we find any definite allusion in Japanese authorities is Tsao Fuh-hing, a retainer of the Emperor Sun K'üan (240 A.D.), who won celebrity as a painter of Buddhist pictures and representations of the Dragon. His memory, however, is now purely legendary. Next on the roll of fame is a Court painter to the monarch Wu Ti (502-549 A.D.), named Chang Sang-yiu, who has left a great reputation in Buddhist art. There appears to be no work of this old master in any collection in China or elsewhere, but some of his followers in later times left enduring marks of their genius. His true successor was Wu Tao-tsz' (the Go Dōshi or Go Dōgen of the Japanese), who held in the Court of the Emperor Ming Hwang, the Louis Quatorze of Medieval China, a position similar to that occupied by the older artist under Wu-Ti. Two specimens of the work of Wu are given in Mr. Anderson's book (Plates LXX. and LXXI.). It is impossible here to refer, even by name, to the leaders who flourished from this period down to the end of the Yüen dynasty, but the summary of the qualities of their art, supported as it is by undeniable specimens, will be a surprise to those who still regard the embellishment of the willow-pattern plate of our childhood as the type of Chinese pictorial design, past and present:—

‘The

‘The style developed under these masters (says Mr. Anderson) who represented the “Northern School” of China, was a remarkable one, characteristic in its nobility, its simplicity, and in its somewhat capricious limitations. As might be expected from a people with whom writing had assumed so exaggerated an importance, the calligraphic element in their works was predominant and all important, but it was strengthened by traces of a rare naturalistic power. There was no attempt at perspective, as we now understand the word; no true *chiaroscuro*, nor any such comprehension of anatomical form as appears in early Greek art; but the painters had studied nature from the aspect of the impressionist, and while closing their eyes to some of its teachings, succeeded in other directions in rendering its meaning with a felicity that appeared to be as much the result of inspiration as of study. In colouring, the tendency of the artist, except in his Buddhistic compositions, was in favour of tender harmonies, secured by the use of pale, transparent, local tints, with a very sparing application of bright pigments; but many of the most highly-prized works were executed in simple monochrome. . . . A bird, an orchid, or a branch of bamboo or flowering plum-tree, sufficed as the subject for a picture; but trivial as such objects may appear to us, they often possessed an abstract meaning for the artist and his patrons in recalling a famous verse, illustrating a sentiment, or symbolising a moral or physical quality. Landscape appeared to have a peculiar charm for many of the most gifted painters, who delighted in perpetuating the wildest scenery that nature offered to their pencils, and dreamed not of the hand-made rockery, toy-shop vegetation, and uninhabitable dwelling-places, which modern porcelain and tea-chest decoration introduces to the world as pictures of China. Portrait-painting, such as Vandyck practised, appears to have had no existence, but the want was compensated for as well as might be by traditional or imaginary portraits of ancient sages or warriors, or of the supernatural creations of Taoist fiction. Lastly, the more complex and dramatic motives were furnished by incidents of history, Buddhistic and Taoistic legendary lore, and moral anecdotes. From this fairly comprehensive selection, some artists were contented to adopt a single item as the speciality upon which they hoped to found a reputation, like Han Kan, who is known only as a painter of horses, and Hwei Tsung, whose name is identified with drawings of the falcons: others sought a larger field for their effects, like Muh Ki, who delineated birds, quadrupeds, and the human figure, all with equal skill: while a few, like Mih Yuën-chang, won fame in every section of their art, and even extended their triumphs to pure calligraphy.’—‘*The Pictorial Arts*,’ p. 257.

This remarkable art began to degenerate soon after the commencement of the Ming period (A.D. 1368), and under the present dynasty its downward path has terminated in a fall so utter, that we may well despair of its resurrection.

Returning to Japan, from which we have digressed in order to

to say a few words about a noble but now almost extinct art, it was not until the middle of the ninth century that a great native representative of Japanese art appeared upon the scene. Kosé no Kanaoka was a patrician of Kioto, attached to the Imperial Court, and—holding aloof from the miserable intrigues that at last destroyed the temporal supremacy of the Mikados—he devoted himself wholly to the practice of painting as handed down from the Chinese masters of Tang dynasty. His name is attached to many a curious and supernatural legend commemorative of the realistic wonders of his delineations of nature, but for us he is the Wu Tao-tsz' of religious art in Japan. All that is left of his handiwork are portraits of Buddhist divinities, probably traditional in design, certainly devoid of the naturalistic inspirations of the early Corean sculptors, but unsurpassable in the beauty and vigour of their calligraphic outline and superb colour-harmonies. We have still much to learn of his work and that of his successors. For the present it will be sufficient to say, that the Kosé line carried on for five centuries the production of a class of Buddhist pictures that must be regarded as the consummation of Oriental genius in colours. The Buddhist painting which shows distinct traces of Indian origin, and, as Mr. Anderson points out, may have drawn some of its breath of life from Greek sources, is probably the most ancient section of Oriental pictorial art.

In intimate association with religious art, and probably evolved from it, was a style applied chiefly to the illustration of the history, current events, and legends of the country. The Yamato, or native, manner was practised by the artists who furnished the gorgeous altar-pieces for the Buddhist temples, and was chiefly in the hands of three family lines, those of Kosé, Takuma, and Kasuga, the last of which has extended down to our own time in the Tosa artists. Their manner, less forcible than the old Chinese secular work, embraced all the beauty of colouring so conspicuous in the early Buddhist painting, but associated with a finer touch, a greater attention to detail, and with less of the majestic sweep of brush that characterized the religious art.

It would encroach too far upon our space to follow the historical development of the various schools. It may be enough to touch upon the principal changes that succeeded the rise of the Buddhist and native schools. In these early periods we hear little of pictures in the simpler non-Buddhist style of the Chinese masters. Such works were undoubtedly produced from time to time, but the strength of the Court painters, who appear

to have monopolized art patronage, was expended over altar-pieces for the Buddhist temples and drawings in the native style, so that there is little to note as novel between the ninth and the thirteenth centuries, except a peculiar vein of caricature which originated in the twelfth century with an abbot of the temple of Toba, and has been maintained by humourists, artistic and non-artistic, down to the present day. Caricature, as known in Japan until very recent years, does not appear to have assumed either a seditious or a personal type, for vengeance was apt to follow close upon the heels of offence in those old days. The drollery of the Toba-yé or Toba pictures depended partly upon the Rabelaisian nature of the favourite motives, partly upon the extravagant badness of the drawing, which bore a certain resemblance to that of the well-known illustrations of the Nonsense verses by Edward Lear. Illustrations of Toba-yé will be found at pages 33 and 34 of Mr. Anderson's book.

For centuries the freehanded monochromes and lightly tinted pictures of the old Chinese masters had found no prominent champions, and the style was in danger of complete and permanent neglect, when a priest named Ka-wō or Riozen (*circa* 1350), to whom is attributed the *Kakémono*, or hanging picture-mount from China, drew attention by precept and practice to the work of a remarkable group of Chinese painters who had succeeded in extending the artistic reputation of the Tang dynasty through the Sung and Yuën periods. These men, some amongst whom bore the most honoured names, were masters of the boldly calligraphic style which afterwards appeared in the paintings of the leaders of the Kano and other classical schools in Japan, a style in which manipulative power attained a degree of perfection it would seem impossible to excel, and in which a certain respect for the claims of naturalism was yet preserved. Writing (*i.e.* the brush-writing of the Chinese) and drawing were brought into a dangerously close relationship, which could not but act destructively, sooner or later, upon the higher aims of the one and the practical utility of the other. Indeed it is not impossible that an undue pride in calligraphy is responsible for the perpetuation of the ideographic system which has done so much to limit the acquisition of new ideas, and to foster the isolation that is only now breaking down under the pressure of external forces. The example of Kawō found favour in the eyes of many of his contemporaries and immediate successors, and one or two generations later a school having like aims was founded at the temple of Sokokuji in Kyoto by a Chinese priest named Josetsu, from which originated directly or indirectly the three great classical academies of Shiubun, Sesshiu and Kano. From that

time

time Chinese art reigned supreme, notwithstanding that the Yamato, or, as it was now called, the Tosa School, was upheld by men of remarkable talents, and Buddhist art had found a grand exponent in Cho Densu (1351-1427), the greatest of all Japanese painters after Kanaoka.

The success of the classical style (the term classical is used by Mr. Anderson advisedly, as the relation of China to Japan in the matter of art and literature was very similar to that of Greece and Rome to European countries of later civilization) was confirmed by the patronage of the Shoguns, those magnates who, from a position of generalissimo of the forces, attained a temporal power before which the dim religious light of the Mikado's spiritual influence was destined to sink almost to extinction. Sesshiu, the painter who had made Japanese art known and respected in China, Oguri Sotan, Shiubun, Kano, Masanobu, Soami, and many more, found honour and profit under the idle but cultured representatives of the Ashikaga Shogunate. Kano Motonobu, the great eclectic in Chinese art, to whom is owing the chief dignity of the still living Kano Academy, rose into fame beneath the same protection. So Chinese were the sections of the Chinese school during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, that many of their alumni appear to have almost forgotten that there was a Japan. Chinese legends and history formed the staple motive of the more complex pictorial compositions; the portraiture was of mythical and historical personages made known by Chinese literature and art; Chinese landscapes took the place of transcripts of native scenery, and even Chinese birds, Chinese quadrupeds, and the scarcely less familiar zoological myths of China were preferred to the fauna that teemed in the plains and forests of the Land of the Rising Sun, within easy reach of the painter's observation. The rule was not without exception, but the exceptions were scarcely more than enough to prove the rule; and as a result the art, removed from the direct and healthy influences of nature, tended in the direction of a fatal conventionality. Its examples, though marvellous as feats of calligraphic skill, strong in composition, and perfect in colouring, were based upon wrong principles, and, as generation succeeded generation, seemed to lose more and more of the elements of vitality imparted by the genius of the early masters. The Buddhist and Yamato schools possessed nothing that could enable them to supersede their once triumphant rival, and the prospects of Japanese painting as an original branch of art had begun to fade when a new phase—that of a popular art—almost suddenly sprang into existence. The true foundation of the Popular School—the school of pictures dealing with the actual experiences

experiences of daily and national life as opposed to Chinese classicality—belongs to the last quarter of the seventeenth century, and was inaugurated by an artisan named Hishigawa Moronobu. This individual, a designer for a Kioto dyer, adopting an idea first developed two generations before by a pupil of the Tosa school named Iwasa Matahei, commenced a series of novel and happy delineations, relating chiefly to his more immediate surroundings, and issued a great number of books with woodcut illustrations, which exercised a remarkable and lasting influence upon the progress of art. Some pictorial books had been published from about the commencement of the seventeenth century, but the execution of the cuts gave little promise of the abilities the Japanese engraver was afterwards to manifest. Moronobu directly or indirectly educated the engravers, and through their medium an art of a really high quality was placed within reach of the masses. The experiment was a remarkable success. Men of talent, some detached from the orthodox schools which were essentially in the hands of the noble and military castes, some springing from the lower ranks of the people, joined in the work, and the *Ukiyo-yé*, 'worldly or popular pictures,' represented a solid and growing art. The labours of Moronobu cannot be overrated, for almost all that we now see and admire in the more familiar albums of Hokusai and his followers was initiated by the humble draughtsman of Kioto. One branch only of popular art fell into other hands. The pictorial record of the plebeian theatre and the early practice of chromo-xylography were developed by his contemporary, Torii Kiyonobu. Another section, although touched upon by Moronobu, found its great leader in the brilliantly original artist Korin, who set the lacquer designers an example almost as pregnant with results as that furnished by Moronobu for the book illustrators. To render justice to these men and their work would require a volume, and we must leave untouched all this and the later expansion of their teaching under Nishigawa, Tachibana, the Katsugawas, the Utagawas and Hiroshige. Examples of the works of these artists are given by Mr. Anderson, pp. 140 *et seq.* But it is impossible to pass over one great artist of this school. The name of Hokusai is, beyond question, the best known in Europe of any Japanese artist. Reproductions of some of his works are obtainable in almost every Western capital. To Mr. Anderson belongs the credit of having given the first European account of this artist (in the 'Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan in 1878'). As to Hokusai's position amongst his own countrymen, Mr. Anderson says :—

'For

'For the acknowledged connoisseurs in pictures—men of high culture in all that constitutes Japanese education—he has no claim to a share in the consideration allotted to the Tosas and Kanos, whose gentle schooling, visible in every line of their work, was a passport of caste that Hokusai did not possess. They do not deny that he has a certain kind of talent, but his training appears to them in a hundred ways that are repugnant to their habits of thought. He is "vulgar," and there is an end of it. This position is natural enough, and need not be unintelligible to any European who believes himself able to recognize, as by an instinct, the character and education of an unknown correspondent in his handwriting and manner of expressing ordinary ideas, but it is narrow and unjust when applied to a man of the genius of Hokusai—as narrow and unjust as would be a criticism that condemns as worthless a Buddhist god by Keion or Cho Densu, because the lines of bone and muscle fall below the standard of anatomical truth that would be expected from the merest tyro in a European art academy. Hokusai was a child of the people, whose little learning was picked up in the cheapest schools, and whose only possible associates in the Japan of his time were the artisans and trades-people amidst whom he lived and for whom he laboured. It could only be expected that his work would bear evidence of his surroundings, but it was not "vulgar" in the sense of coarse or offensive. . . . His pictures have gladdened us with bright transcripts of life, energy, and new ideas, written in the tersest and most powerful language, and we need not pause in our verdict to ask whether he is or is not one of the prophets for whom there is no honour in his own country.'

Mr. Anderson then proceeds to deprecate the unmeasured and enthusiastic praises which have been bestowed by some European critics on Hokusai :—

'To regard him,' he says, 'as the greatest artist of Japan, and as the crowning representative of all that is excellent in Japanese art is unjust to the art,' but 'if we study him in the lower but broad and fertile region that he chose for himself, we find him without an equal.'

We pass on now to another departure which has prepared the way for the scientific development which Japanese painting must inevitably undergo. Naturalism was by no means absent even in the earliest days of Japanese art, but the calligraphic conventions adopted from the Chinese were adverse to its influence in painting, and the various branches of art, which drew their inspiration from the painter, naturally became affected by the open disregard for the observation of nature in detail. A century after the rise of the Popular School, a painter of Kioto, named Maruyama Okio, started the theory, that the actual forms of life should be copied with as much fidelity as was compatible with artistic force, and he founded in Shijo Street, in Kioto, a school which brought around him
a brilliant

a brilliant band of followers. It was not to be expected, however, that the conventions of centuries should at once be cast to the winds, and hence the practice of the Shijo Naturalists was only a compromise between tradition and truth; but within certain limits their observation of nature was felicitous in an extraordinary degree, and some of the leaders of the movement lived to see their principles spreading through the whole of artistic Japan. For Europeans, the works of Okio, Sosen, Ippo, Hoya, and other masters of the school, will not indeed represent the noblest achievements of Japanese pictorial art, but they will promise more for the future of painting in the Far East than even the masterpieces of Kanaoka, Chô Densu, and of Sesshiu. Before passing away from this very brief sketch of the history of Japanese art, it may be well to quote the passage of Mr. Anderson's book (p. 114) with which he concludes his elaborate history:—

‘There is yet in all sections an enormous sum of facts lying entombed in old manuscripts and in the memories of native connoisseurs; and thousands of specimens that will illustrate as many new points for comment still remain in the obscurity of private collections; but the material is already being brought to light, and, let us hope, will soon be utilized for the completion of the story of which only a few episodes are here narrated. New methods of pictorial reproduction may render it possible to lay facsimiles of the most precious of the ancient works before the world; new schools will arise to create new matter for the critic and historian; and lastly, each of the many branches of art will have its special investigators, and special volumes to record the results of their labours.’

We come now to the applications of the pictorial arts, as to which Mr. Anderson observes, that they do not in Japan ‘differ in many important respects from those in vogue with European nations, but extend more widely in the direction of embellishment of objects of utility.’ We cannot follow the learned author into the details of the application of the painter's art to various objects—decorations of the walls and ceilings of temples and houses, pictorial embellishments of screens, fans, hanging and rolled pictures, books, lacquer, ceramics, &c., all of which are treated in detail—but must confine ourselves to one or two points. The most interesting of the many applications here referred to is perhaps the art of engraving on wood. Mr. Satow* has taught us the antiquity of block-printing in Japan, and we now learn from Mr. Anderson that pictorial engraving was perhaps carried into actual practice by the Buddhist priesthood

* ‘Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan,’ vol. x.

from a period as early as the eighth or ninth century, and that the famous woodcut of St. Christopher was certainly anticipated a full hundred years by authentic examples of Japanese xylography, facsimile reproductions of which are given by Mr. Anderson at pages 115 *et seq.* It is not, however, till the commencement of the seventeenth century that any lay application of engraving can be traced. In fact, so far as we know at present, the oldest illustrated book is an edition of the famous classic, the '*Isé Monogatari*,' published in 1608,* but this and the volumes which followed it were coarse, and scarcely equal to the contemporary woodcuts of the Chinese. It was not until Moronobu appeared on the scene that the real talents of the Japanese engraver were exhibited. Chromo-xylography, effected by a series of blocks printed in succession, was comparatively late, and, like the simpler art, it was derived from China. As in the latter case, it quickly attained a perfection which the inventors have never approached. The first essays in colour-printing appear to have been introduced about 1695. The designers and engravers both gained rapidly in experience and proficiency, and although the best examples of the work claimed no higher motives than theatrical portraits and fancy representations of ladies of suspicious popularity and gorgeous raiment, they offer something that has never been equalled in the same branch of art in Western countries. Our present knowledge of Japanese wood-engraving supplies a new and very important chapter in the history of the art, and one from which the amateur may derive keen pleasure, and the practical engraver a little measure of profit.

The consideration of technique in its more minute particulars would scarcely attract the general reader, but a few points of interest stand out in bold relief. There is no doubt, that Chinese and Japanese painters owe their brilliancy of brush to the practice afforded by the exercise of hand and eye, in forming the complex and graceful ideographs, which have been so injurious to the higher interests of both peoples. The hand of the writer or draughtsman is unembarrassed by support of any kind; every joint of the extremity, from the collar-bone to finger, takes part in the formal rise of the stroke, and the motion of the brush has therefore a range, freedom, and precision, that Rubens might have envied. The use of silk as a favourite surface for the application of ink and colour is another peculiarity of Sinico-Japanese art, and the painter knows how to secure the greatest

* A copy of this work is to be found in the Anderson Collection in the British Museum, and facsimile reproductions in Mr. Anderson's book.

advantage from the physical qualities of the material. The application of crude pigment upon the reverse side of the textile, leaving a deliciously softened view of the tint through the translucent fibre, is particularly deserving of remark. The use of gold in leaf or powder, somewhat after the manner of the missal illuminators of the fourteenth century, is another characteristic, and it is somewhat curious that in the oldest works extant the leaf was employed even for the finest lines and most complicated tracery of diaper. In the production of gradations of effect in gold the Japanese stand alone. The pigments are not very numerous, and there are a few rather serious deficiencies in the palette of the Japanese artist; but permanence, except in the arsenical green, which plays too large a part in the works of the Tosa school, is secured by a loving care in the minutiae of preparation; and long experience has made the harmonious application of the tints a process which, even for the rank and file of the profession, is as easy as it is unerring. But the importation of European pigments within the last twenty years has revealed a very curious fact, viz. that the colour sense of the Japanese disappears when his familiar materials are replaced by new ones, for the man, who could delight us with the sweetest and most tender of chromatic symphonies, will perpetrate without a qualm the most terrible discords that lie within the compass of a second-rate French or English colour-box. Again, the Japanese artist seems to possess the faculty of painting with equal facility in almost every posture. We find him standing at the easel very much in the posture of his European brother, but without the mahl stick, or slung on high on his back to decorate a ceiling, or sitting upon his hams at the lowest of tables, or stretching his limbs widely over an ample sheet spread out upon the floor before him—yet never losing a fraction of his command of the flying pencil. In most essential respects, however, his methods do not differ materially from those of European painters, and the tricks described by foreign writers, as practised for their edification by 'celebrated artists,' are merely feats of legerdemain, to which only the lower class of draughtsmen would condescend to abase their art.

On the subject of the characteristics of Japanese art, Mr. Anderson has the following apposite remarks:—

'The ideal of the Japanese painter differs in so many respects from that of his European *confrère*, that it is not possible to adopt the same standard of criticism for the works that express the æsthetic instincts of the two races. The Japanese picture is the *avatara* of an art now extinct, that of ancient China; and until recently has maintained

maintained intact almost the whole of those characteristics that distinguished its forerunner from the more scientifically constructed art of modern Europe. In its present form it must be judged by itself, with a generous appreciation for its merits, and a liberal indulgence for such shortcomings as result from errors of teaching. We must recollect that the Japanese painter, fettered as he has been for centuries by traditions of practice that exaggerated the importance of calligraphic skill and excluded the study of chiaroscuro, perspective and anatomy, has, nevertheless, succeeded in revealing to us a wealth of grace and suggestiveness that might induce the sternest critic to forgive all the faults of his system, though it may not justify the ardent admirers who cite these very faults as models for imitation. A study of his best works may show defects of detail which any student trained in European schools could readily perceive and correct; but to the true artist it will present something that lies beyond the reach of academical philosophy—a something that defies scientific analysis, and gives evidence that the imperfect mechanism has been guided by the motive power of genius. Although he has indeed missed a portion of the exquisite forms of nature, and is sometimes guilty of deliberate violation of truth, he has seized with a wonderfully comprehensive grasp the spirit and meaning of his subject as a whole; and, if there is much that he may learn from his European fellow-workers, he has certainly proved his ability to teach some memorable lessons in return. But while every allowance is granted for the influence of time-honoured errors of theory, the consequent peculiarities of practice must not be dismissed without comment, for these eccentricities, and the almost unconscious efforts of the artist to compensate for them by a variety of ingenious expedients, lend to the result many of its most striking features, and may provide material for curious speculations in some future study of comparative art as a part of the general history of man.—Page 183.

The calligraphic bases of the typical Sinico-Japanese picture is one of the most remarkable features of the art, as it involves a peculiar kind of symbolism of natural forms that pervades nearly all the works of the painters of the two countries.* How much has been sacrificed to the relations between writing and drawing, it is impossible to say. The earlier and greater masters were able to preserve the sentiment of nature in the midst of the *tours de force* of the calligrapher; but the power of brush, which at first lent grace and decision to the interpretation of the forms of life, became abused by men who would not see the infinite superiority in grace and significance of the lines written by the hand of nature to the most brilliant flourishes that ever grew under the pen of the writing-master. The revolt of the Shijo artists against the increasing degradation of the

* At p. 187 of Mr. Anderson's work there is a striking illustration of Japanese calligraphy, reduced one-half, from a drawing in the British Museum Collection.

aims of art was a wholesome protest of common-sense against the affectation of facile mediocrity, and fortunately a few men like Okio and Hoya (Fig. 34 and 35) were equal to the task of demonstrating the compatibility of perfect truth with perfect beauty. As colourists, from the sensuous point of view, the Japanese have little to learn from us, and perhaps a good deal to teach, but the same tendency to symbolism, that appears in the representation of form, is distinctly marked in the employment of colour. The conventions of art prescribe, that the sun must be painted in vermilion; that the foliage of the pine shall assume no other tint than verdigris; that no justice can be done to the glitter of a golden ornament, except by the use of the precious metal itself; and the artist submits with the best possible grace, never failing to make the most of the decorative qualities of the arbitrary selections. In every department of the painter's art the story is the same. True chiaroscuro is not permissible in the Japanese picture. Shadow gradations are indeed suggested in many cases; but high lights, reflected lights, and projected shadows, are systematically ignored, even by the naturalists themselves. Light, for the painter, is a quality of the atmosphere, penetrating everywhere without let or obstacle, and owing to no precise source of origin. The illumination of a 'nocturne' differs in no respect from that of a day scene, and if the artist considers it necessary to specify the particular portion of the twenty-four hours in which the scene is cast, he must inscribe upon his sky the accepted symbol of the sun or of the moon, but neither the one nor the other is required to do more than look on in an irresponsible way at things in general as at something with which it has no immediate concern. Perspective, except amongst the half-educated artisan artists of the last hundred years, is isometrical, and such perplexities as vanishing points, horizontal lines, and points of station, vex not the soul of artist or of art critic in the Far East. If the painter desires to represent a comprehensive view of an interior, he spirits away the roof of the building, and is thus able to show us far more at a glance than we could hope to see under the tame limitations of optical science in the West; but where he delineates a landscape, his interpretation of the relative distance of objects by proportionate alterations of size is generally free from obvious error, and his effects are enhanced by a wonderfully forcible use of aerial perspective. In the treatment of the elements of a landscape, conventions of omission and commission are everywhere apparent. The painter's sky is devoid of cloud forms, unless some point in the story told by the picture necessitates the introduction of a conventional cumulus. Water has

has no transparency, unless the property be called forth by some similar utilitarian motive. It is only permitted to reflect the images of objects from its surface under similar conditions, and the phenomenon of refraction has never met with a glimpse of recognition. Yet the men who ignore all this can bring before us the grand sweep of the cataract, the smiling ripples of the wind-kissed lake, and the rush of the mountain torrent with a few touches that sum up all that is best in impressionistic art. It is distracting to see, how often the genius and the imbecility of observation appear side by side in the same production of the artist's brush. In the forms of animal and vegetable life the same inconsistencies appear. The misshapen body and limbs of man and horse defy all anatomical laws, but are full of life and motion; and the bird, however indefinite it may be as to species, cleaves the air with a life-like grace of motion that finds no representation in European art. It is true that in some of the works of Okio and his followers, truth of detail and the higher truths of vitality are combined: it is, however, only in such animals as monkeys, and in birds, and fishes, where the visible anatomical forms are not very complex, but the human form is always conventionalized by the naturalists with nearly as little compromise as by the Kano painters. And yet even the most subtle of nature's outlines is well within the grasp of the Japanese artist, who misses his mark, not from want of artistic power or capacity for observation, but from a radical fault in his elementary education. He has not learned that the workman in art must have served his apprenticeship by the study of the smallest details of his subject, before his selective powers can safely be trusted with the record of his impressions of the greater facts. In the words of Mr. Anderson:—

‘The Japanese painter has endowments which leave a heavy balance in his favour—a large share of that quality in art which, for want of a better name, may be called “power”; a perfect appreciation of harmony in colour; an instinctive sense of effectiveness and propriety in composition; unequalled command of pencil; a ready and fertile invention; and, when he is disposed to exercise it, a keen and intelligent gift of observation. Let him learn to use all the wealth with which nature has favoured him, and shake off the encumbrance of unprofitable conventions, and his triumph in the higher sections of painting will be worthy of that which has placed him beyond rivalry in the more practical sphere of decorative art.’—P. 251.

Mr. Anderson's Catalogue must be regarded as in a certain degree complementary to his larger volume. The title ‘Catalogue of Pictures,’ invokes in the mind of the reader a spectre of the inexorable paper-covered list, with its laconic proclamations of number,

number, subject, and name of artist, for which we disburse the unwilling coin at the doors of the Royal Academy; but a compilation of this kind, however useful it may be as a guide to an exhibition of European pictures at Burlington House, would only serve to bewilder the visitor to a collection of Japanese works of art. Such an inscription as 'No. 1255. Pêh I. and Shuh Tsi, by Kano Motonobu,' would scarcely elicit expressions of gratitude from the person who takes the trouble to seek for information concerning a Japanese picture. But if he is able to learn who the two personages known under the extraordinary names just quoted were, and to comprehend the moral of the story told by the artist's pencil; if he is placed in a position to discover something about the school to which the picture belongs, and the personality of its author, he will have no reasonable cause of complaint. This is precisely what Mr. Anderson gives us in this 'Catalogue,' at the expense of an amount of original and entirely novel research, that will require no comment for those who know anything of the difficulties that bristle round such a task in a country so recently brought within the range of European interests.

The plan of the book is such, that the work of reference is as easy as the circumstances will permit. We are told, that the pictures have been classified according to schools, and to each group is prefixed an account of the main facts in the history of the school, with a list of the principal artists whose names have found a place in native biographical records; and, lastly, the legendary and other motives have been dealt with, more or less in detail. Thus, after a few pages of prefatory matter, which includes a very useful bibliography, the Catalogue opens with a sketch of the early history of Japanese painting, with some remarks upon the artistic relations of India and Persia to Japan. The practical portion of the book begins with the story of Buddhist art, the descent of which is traced from India through China and Corea to Japan; the characteristic features of the style are described, the most famous painters who produced works of this nature are enumerated, and the subjects of Buddhist origin that are most frequently illustrated by the artists of the sacred and secular schools are recounted at length. These are followed by a list of the one hundred and forty-eight specimens attached to this section, with as much description and comment as appears necessary for the comprehension of each. The Yamato, or native school, is next treated in like manner, and so on through the Chinese school and its allies, the Sesshiu and Kano schools. This concludes the history of the more archaic phases of the art, and an account of the comparatively modern

Popular, Korin, Shijo, and Ganku schools brings to a close the Japanese portion of the Catalogue. An appendix relating to seals and signatures gives a list of the titles—more often depreciatory than honorific—which artists and others were wont to add to their names after their real or nominal retirement from the turmoil of worldly interests. Thus one artist subscribes himself 'Gentai the hermit' (literally mountain-man); another 'the unserviceable' Keizan; another adds a suffix which implies one who practises religious austerities; another, with perhaps a touch of the devil's darling sin, dubs himself 'stupid fellow,' or 'uncivilized man;' while others are content with merely signifying that they have passed the meridian of life by the term 'Ancient.' As the author points out, age carries with it a great claim to respect both in China and Japan. The deference shown to the aged, to parents, and to superiors in station, is, for the European, one of the most striking features of life in the Far East, where it appears not only as a tribute that takes nothing from the self-respect of him who pays it, but as a habit that makes the social and domestic wheels work with a degree of smoothness, of which people who have been civilized out of all this might well be envious. Mr. Anderson's comment on this interesting social feature in his remarks on the stories of the 'Twenty-four Paragons of Filial Piety,' is worth reproducing:—

'The style of diction of the various anecdotes is characterized by a somewhat abrupt simplicity that places the moral at once within the intellectual grasp of the little ones for whose benefit they are intended. The matter, equally free from complexity, is often noble and touching, and though in some cases too suggestive of the nursery to appeal to the adult mind, is, as a whole, well adapted to the end to be attained. It is impossible to over-estimate the influence of such examples, impressed as they are in a hundred ways upon every Japanese infant from its earliest years, until the principles are accepted as axioms that are unquestioned even where they are disregarded. The passive obedience and self-abnegation, which the child is so taught to show for all who stand towards him in the relationship of parent or guardian, not only facilitates the control of the household, and robs the decrepitude of age of much of its sadness, but in former days it prepared the way for the still more exacting code that regulated the bond between the retainer and his feudal lord. The feudal system is now ended, but parental authority has not yet been swept away, and few Englishmen, who have seen anything of the inner life of the Japanese, can fail to have been struck with the proudly respectful bearing of children of all ages towards their real or adopted fathers and mothers, and the happy resignation with which these accept—or even welcome—the enfeeblement of advancing years, when it is so well compensated by the augmenting consideration of those who are most dear to them. It is this, too, which

which indemnifies the woman for the comparatively obscure position to which she is relegated by her matrimonial relations, for as a mother she commands a degree of veneration from her children fully equal to that accorded to her husband and master, and in her children's children may claim a multiplied solace.'—Catalogue, p. 172.

The second and shorter division of the Catalogue relates to Chinese pictorial art. It is very significant of the connection between the art of the two countries that the subjects, treated by the painters of the Middle Kingdom, repeat in nearly all cases those with which we have been familiarized by the pages devoted to Japan, and a reference to the illustrations of the Chinese section in 'The Pictorial Arts' will prove, that the correspondence extended in even a more striking degree to the calligraphic ideal and special conventions of execution. The historical matter is brief, but it is the first indication ever vouchsafed to us that Chinese painting offers anything for the consideration of the historian. Finally, a very complete index, and a list of the names of the principal artists, written side by side with their Chinese ideographs, bring the foregoing matter readily within the reach of enquirers.

One of the principal features of the Catalogue is the fund of legend, history, and folk-lore, collected to explain the motives of the pictures, and it is probable that the extent of this material will give the work a value for many persons, who are little interested in the æsthetic side of the subject. Some of the stories are remarkable for their novel quaintness; others are equally noteworthy for reasons of an opposite kind, viz. the strong family resemblance which they offer to anecdotes that we have always regarded as specially belonging to the European nursery and schoolroom; a third set take us behind the scenes painted for us by Western travellers, and allow us a glimpse of the true life and ideas of the Japanese and Chinese. Others, again, bring us into contact with many incidents of history that have escaped record in the summaries at present accessible to us. Many of the most interesting of these are too long for reproduction, but one or two examples may be taken by way of illustration. The story of the disappearance of the great Chinese painter Wu Tao-tsz', whose name has already occurred more than once in this article, introduces us to a somewhat startling departure in fiction. It runs as follows:—

'Ming Hwang (the Imperial patron of the artist) having commanded Wu Tao-tsz' to paint a landscape upon the wall of one of the apartments in the palace, the artist screened the surface prepared for his work by the folds of a curtain, behind which he retired to carry out the task unseen. After a while he reappeared to announce

its completion, and drawing aside the veil, revealed to his patron a glorious scene, spreading out into infinite space, diversified with glade and forest, winding streams and azure mountains, and in all its myriad details vying with nature in her fairest aspects. While the Emperor gazed in rapture upon the marvellous creation, the painter, indicating a gateway before a stately building in the foreground of the picture, clapped his hands, and the entrance flew open. "The interior is beautiful beyond conception," said the artist. "Permit me to show the way that Your Majesty may enter and behold the wonders it contains." Then, passing within, he beckoned his master to follow; but in a moment the gate closed behind him, and before the amazed sovereign could advance a step the scene faded like a vision, leaving the wall blank as before the contact of the painter's brush. And Wu Tao-tsz' was never seen again.—'Pictorial Arts,' p. 255.

Side by side with this may be placed a moral anecdote which may be found in close parallel in most European languages:—

'It relates how a selfish man, tired of the trouble and expense of maintaining an aged and crippled father, determined to take him to a desert place and there abandon him to starvation. He prepared a rough cart for the removal, and, aided by his child, a little boy, reached the destined spot. Setting down the cart with its helpless burden, he was about to return home, when his son begged to be allowed to take back the vehicle. "What will be the use of it?" asked his father. "To bring you here when you are as old as my grandfather," was the reply. And the man, recalled to a sense of shame, wept, and taking back his parent, ever afterwards tended him with kindness.'—Catalogue, p. 172.

The accounts of the Sinico-Japanese Dragon (p. 48), of the Demons (p. 59), the essay upon the Seven Gods of Good Fortune, so familiar to every collector of Japanese *bric-à-brac* (pp. 27 *et seq.*), the sketch of 'Mythical Zoology,' which formed so rich a storehouse of subjects for the artists of China and of the Chinese school in Japan (pp. 166 *et seq.*), the story of Ono no Komachi (p. 121), of the dream of Rosei (p. 392), and the collection of stories of the Rip van Winkle type (p. 105), may be pointed as other sources from which the artist drew for subjects, but the limits of our space will not allow of more than a reference to the original text.

Descriptive annotations seem to have been avoided as far as possible, but where the subject is either typical or special there is no want of detail. A landscape by the Japanese painter Shiubun has been selected for description, as a type of the idealized scenery in favour with artists of the Chinese school:—

'This is a typical example of the idealized Chinese scenery which impressed so strongly the imaginations of the Japanese masters of the

the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Such works were amongst the most daringly "composed" of landscape paintings, and seem intended rather to note the vague conceptions and reminiscences of the poetic minds of the artists, than to hand down the true features of any particular locality; yet they suggested distance, atmosphere, and even chiaroscuro, with so much picturesque force, that it would be ungrateful to assault with naturalistic dicta such striking creations of the brush.

'The painting is in monochrome, sketched upon a yellowish bibulous Chinese paper, once of smooth uniform surface, but now cracked and discoloured by age. It is vigorously outlined with a free brush, and the effects of aerial perspective are secured by broad, delicately softened washes of dilute ink. The elements of the scene are few and simple. The foreground on the right shows the edge of a rugged cliff, crowned with giant cryptomerias and channelled by a torrent that sweeps over its craggy sides in a multitude of slender cataracts, to plunge with graceful curve into the foaming basin beneath. A winding stream, spanned by a quaintly fashioned bridge, descends through the valley to open into a broad, rapid river above the falls; and two mountain heights rear their fantastic peaks into the clear sky high above the mists that veil their feet. The prospect is overlooked by the gabled roof and curling eaves of a summer palace; and a philosopher, bent with years, is seen lingering on his path near the cascade to catch the music of the hurtling waters.'—Catalogue, p. 197.

We have referred in some detail to this Catalogue, because the great collection it classifies and describes will be on view in the new print rooms of the British Museum; and students or admirers of Chinese and Japanese art will then be enabled, by direct reference to a large series of representative examples, to note the peculiarities of style which have distinguished various schools and periods, and to trace the original sources of the innumerable motives which have hitherto been the cause of much perplexity. The collection, which is the first that has been brought together and classified from the historical and academical point of view, is brought within the grasp of every student by this Catalogue, which is a Handbook to Japanese Pictorial Art rather than a Catalogue in the ordinary sense of the word. The unique merit of the collector is, that he has been the first to bring Japanese pictures together from a scientific standpoint, and to commence the evolution of order out of chaos in the matters of schools, periods and motives. Meanwhile, it may be mentioned that Plates 1, 20, 34, 38, 40, 44, 47, 51, 55, 62, 64, 68, 70, 71, 75, and 118 in the 'Pictorial Arts' may be regarded as representatives of the different styles of paintings referred to in this article.

Mr. Anderson's two books, taken together, may be regarded

as

as forming one of the most interesting and valuable artistic works of recent years. They reveal to the student, in more than one department of human effort, a wholly new and unexpected field. The industrial arts of the Far East have become tolerably familiar in recent years in Europe; the pictorial arts, on which all others ultimately rest, have been hitherto unknown, except to one or two students, and have been wholly inaccessible to the West. Other labourers there will unquestionably be in the future in the vineyard; the material must necessarily be enlarged as conflicting authorities are reconciled, and as new evidence is brought to light, but it is to the pioneers, who have opened a new country and indicated the lines of exploration, that the chief honour must be awarded. That honour in the domain of Japanese pictorial art belongs, beyond doubt, to Mr. Anderson. In the great work, '*The Pictorial Arts of Japan*,' to which we have so constantly referred in this article, everything that excellent literary taste and artistic judgment, capacity for luminous arrangement, skill in selecting examples and in presenting results could do to attract the student and connoisseur, and to render the comprehension of the leading principles of this interesting and instructive art easy and satisfactory, has been done.

We have left ourselves no space to comment adequately on the present tendencies of Japanese art, or to attempt to cast the horoscope of its future. In art, as in much else in modern Japan, the all-important question, *Whither?* must be left to the future to answer with certainty. On this subject Mr. Anderson says:—

'This ancient phase of pictorial art is destined to pass away, and already its images, overlapped by those of a new ideal, betray all the confusion of the change in a dissolving view; but it will leave indelible traces on that which is to replace it, and it must always possess a powerful attraction for the student, not only as matter for an important and interesting section of art history, but as a record of the mental, moral, and social characteristics of the people and castes by whom it was nourished and in some degree created. It is not, however, in the past or in the present, that we must seek to discover the full range of the capacity of the Japanese painter, but in the future; and while we appreciate earnestly all that he has already effected, we reserve our highest admiration for the evidence that his work affords of an unmeasured force yet to be brought into action.'

With this hopeful forecast of the future of Japanese art from one who, after devoting many years to its study, has now been the first to expound its mysteries to the West, we may fitly conclude this article.

- ART. V.—1. *The Expansion of England*. By J. R. Seeley, M.A. London, 1884.
2. *By the West to the East. Memorandum on some Imperial Aspects of the Completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway*. London, March 1886.
3. *Parliamentary Debates*. Canadian Hansard. 1880-1-2-3-4-5.
4. *Canadian Pacific Railway: Annual Report for 1885*.

ROBERT CAVELIER, better known as the Sieur de la Salle, accepted in 1666 from the Sulpician Fathers of Montreal the grant, on easy terms, of a tract of land situate about nine miles from that settlement, and just above the last and fiercest of the rapids of the St. Lawrence. Cavalier certainly did not accept this grant with the intention of merely cultivating his new property, nor even of aiding his feudal lords in defending the village from Indian incursions. The post of danger occupied by La Salle was regarded by him as a base from which to push onward to the discovery of a new route to China and Cathay, an enterprise to which, from the first day of his landing in Canada, he seems to have devoted himself. Like many others who, themselves firmly possessed of an idea, have failed to make their friends share in their enthusiasm, La Salle was regarded as a dreamer. When his first expedition to the West reached, after much suffering, the end of Lake Ontario, its leader found no one willing to pursue with him the supposed route to China by the valley of the Ohio River; and those who turned back eastwards gave to his seigniory near the St. Lawrence rapids, in derision, we are told, of their leader's dreamy projects, the nickname of 'La Chine.'

In a strange way, and after long intervals, the onward march of the world is resumed along tracks once trodden, but which for ages have been deserted. The old route by the Ottawa Valley, which the pioneers and missionaries of the seventeenth century used for reaching the upper Lakes of North America, was for nearly two centuries neglected and almost forgotten, in favour of the easier line by the St. Lawrence and the lower Lakes. But now once more that line resumes its importance; and, while it was never given to La Salle himself to approach the Pacific Ocean or even to penetrate further west than the Mississippi, trains will in a very short time be thundering across his old homestead at Lachine, carrying passengers, mails, and merchandise, by that which, after all, has proved to be the most expeditious route between Europe and China.

Of necessity in a country so extensive as Canada the develop-
ment

ment of lines of communication between its several parts has been one of the primary duties of the Government. Hence the enormous outlay upon canals and railways made both before and since the Confederation of the several Provinces. Hence, too, it results that the construction of Canada's latest and most important work, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is really the history for the time of Canada itself. A work, then, which is so particularly representative of England's greatest colony, which is so vast in length, and has been so dramatic in the rapidity of its execution, should have in these pages some record of its history and of its construction. And, further, as as it promises to be intimately associated with the great future of the British Empire, it may also claim consideration in respect of its Imperial and commercial value.

It is unnecessary to decide to whom is due the credit of first giving practical shape to the idea of constructing a transcontinental railway in British North America; but as long ago as 1847 Major Carmichael Smyth, in a letter addressed to 'Sam Slick,' strongly advocated its execution as an Imperial work. 'This national highway,' he wrote, 'from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is the great link required to unite in one chain the whole English race. It will be the means of enabling vessels steaming from our magnificent colonies—from New Zealand, Van Diemen's Land, New South Wales, New Holland, from Borneo and the West Coast of China, from the Sandwich Isles, and a thousand other places—all carrying the rich products of the East, to land them at the commencement of the West, to be forwarded and distributed throughout our North American Provinces and delivered within thirty days at the ports of Great Britain.'

Railways have rendered most efficient aid in making Canada the country that she is to-day. The Grand Trunk line first practically united Upper and Lower Canada. The unfortunate Ashburton Treaty, by extending the northern frontier of Maine to the highlands overlooking the St. Lawrence, having made the separation between the maritime and inland provinces of Canada almost complete, no close political or commercial union between them was possible, until railway communication from the Atlantic seaboard to Quebec through British territory had been provided. Hence the repeated efforts made to construct such a road, the necessity for which was more than ever demonstrated at the 'Trent Affair' in 1861; and hence, when the proposal for a Confederation of all the Provinces was mooted in 1864, one of the essential conditions stipulated for by the Maritime Provinces was the immediate construction

tion of the Intercolonial Railway. For military and political reasons that railway was kept as far as possible from the American frontier, the mileage between Halifax and Quebec being thereby increased to a very considerable extent; and for this, among other reasons, the line can hardly be considered to have been commercially a success. It has been in some quarters assumed that, because the Canadian Pacific Railway is the result of political necessity, therefore its commercial fate cannot be other than that of the Intercolonial Railway. But, as we proceed with our narrative, it will be seen that the conditions of the two lines are not similar, and that their prospects therefore will most probably be different.

On July 1st, 1867, the Act of Union, assented to by the Imperial Parliament in March, came into force, and the Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, became the Dominion of Canada. In 1870, Rupert's Land and all the territories theretofore controlled by the Hudson's Bay Company; in 1871, British Columbia; and in 1872, Prince Edward Island, were severally admitted into the Confederation, which since the latter date has comprised all British North America with the exception of Newfoundland.

In a country of such peculiar geographical features, a political union, however cleverly designed and ably directed, would avail but little, were not a physical union by means of a trans-continental railway speedily provided. Riel's rebellion in 1870 demonstrated alike the necessity and the difficulty of reaching the Red River Settlement. No one doubted the vigour and 'push' of Colonel Wolseley, but it took the expeditionary force which he commanded ninety-five days to reach Fort Garry from Toronto. It would have been impossible for the Government at Ottawa to control a sparse population in the North-West, so far removed from the Executive and the more settled provinces; while the attempt to do so could not but result in enormous expenditure, with no corresponding advantage. To increase the population was difficult, so long as the sole access to the country lay through the United States. It was not, however, the North-West Territories only that had to be considered. As the Atlantic Provinces had stipulated for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, so the Pacific Province, on entering the Confederation, insisted upon the construction of a railway that should give her access through British territory to her sister provinces in the East. Compliance with this demand was felt to be a commercial as well as a political necessity, and Sir John Macdonald, with a boldness that exasperated his opponents and almost staggered his friends,

friends, promised that the line should be completed within ten years.

In 1871 the Dominion Parliament passed a Resolution to the effect, that the Pacific Railway should be undertaken 'by private enterprise, and not by the Government, and that the public aid to be given to secure the undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of land, and such subsidy in money or other aid, not unduly pressing upon the industry and resources of the Dominion, as the Parliament of Canada shall hereafter determine.' That aid was in 1872 fixed at \$30,000,000 in cash, and a land grant amounting to 54,700,000 acres. But Sir Hugh Allan, and the Company which he formed, could not induce capitalists to embark in the undertaking on these terms. In 1874, the Liberal-Conservative Cabinet of Sir John Macdonald gave way to a Liberal, or 'Grit,' Government under Mr. Alexander Mackenzie's leadership; and, however they might criticize the recklessness, as they termed it, of a policy that had undertaken to accomplish impossibilities, the new Administration frankly admitted that all Canada was in favour of, and was committed to, the construction of a transcontinental line with all speed; with the reservation, however, equally insisted upon by both parties, that its construction should not materially increase the fiscal burdens of the people. In 1875, as the original compact was then obviously impossible of fulfilment, a new agreement with British Columbia was, by Lord Carnarvon's help, arrived at, by which a large sum was to be annually expended on railways in that province, and the line was to be completed as far eastward as Lake Superior by 1890. Thus, within fifteen years some 1900 miles of railway were to be constructed; a task of the probable fulfilment of which Mr. Mackenzie could only bring himself to speak in the following cautious terms: 'We shall always endeavour to proceed with this work as fast as the circumstances of the country—circumstances yet to be developed—will enable us to do, so as to obtain as soon as possible complete railway communication with the Pacific Province. How soon that time may come I cannot predict.' Mr. Mackenzie's aspirations, it will be observed, were limited to the construction of a line from Lake Superior westward; the link eastwards to form a connection with the railways of older Canada being an undertaking far too onerous, it was then thought, to be embarked in.

The new Cabinet altered the form of subsidy, and offered \$10,000 and 20,000 acres per mile, and in addition a Government guarantee of 4 per cent. for twenty-five years on such further amount of capital as might be named by those who tendered

tendered for the work. But these terms, also, were unsuccessful in attracting capitalists, and in 1875 the decision of the previous Parliament in favour of private enterprise was reversed, and it was settled that the work should be undertaken by the Government itself.

Sufficient work was done in the next few years to show, not only how fatal to the success of the great Transcontinental Railway its construction by Government would be, but also how imperfectly each of the political parties understood what was required to make such a line a commercial success. Mr. Mackenzie, for instance, must be credited with the ingenious proposal to give an amphibious character to the line, by 'utilizing the magnificent water stretches' which lakes and river afforded; a proposal which, if carried out, would have absolutely marred the usefulness of the railway as a through route.

When the Mackenzie Cabinet fell in 1879, and Sir John Macdonald returned to power, the Railway Department was placed in the hands of Sir Charles Tupper, an indication at once of the important part that railway extension would play in the policy of the new Cabinet, and of the vigour with which that policy would be maintained. The work both of surveys and of construction was accordingly pushed on; the 'magnificent water stretches' were abandoned; rails were laid from Emerson to Winnipeg, so that, at least through the United States, railway access to Manitoba was secured; and at the same time every effort was made to complete the line between Lake Superior and the Red River, so as to obtain, at all events in summer, a purely Canadian route to the North-West.

About this time the attitude of the Liberal party towards the Pacific Railway project appears to have undergone a change. Mr. Mackenzie, we have seen, had, when in power, admitted and heartily striven to carry out the obligations in regard to the construction of this line, which his predecessor had contracted. The Conservative Opposition, though in the nature of things critical as to details, seem in the main to have loyally supported the Government in pressing on the work. But soon after the parties changed sides in the House of Commons, and especially when Mr. Mackenzie's influence with his party, owing to his failing health, began to wane, a new departure in Opposition policy was made. The Liberals said that to carry out the country's obligations to British Columbia was impossible; that to attempt to do so would impose upon the Dominion financial burdens of an absolutely ruinous oppressiveness; that the idea of a railway from ocean
to

to ocean, entirely avoiding foreign soil, must be relegated to a dim and very distant future; and, with a strangely unpatriotic perverseness, they laid stress upon the merits and advantages of the Western States of the Union as a reason why their own grand possessions in the Canadian North-West would long remain neglected. The result, however, to the country of this strange perversity was good; for the Cabinet, thwarted by the obstacles put in their way, were driven to revert to the original plan of having the work executed by an independent company.

A few Canadians, whose reputation stood equally high for shrewdness, courage, and probity, had recently converted a bankrupt railway in the Western States, thereafter known as the St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Manitoba Railway, into a prosperous concern; profitable to themselves and extremely useful to the public. To these gentlemen, most of them their political opponents, the Government turned, and induced them, after due consideration, to take upon themselves the execution of a work that had already upset one Government, had materially contributed to defeat another, and which, it was commonly said, would yet be the death of many another Administration before it was completed.

In January 1881 Sir Charles Tupper, as Minister of Railways and Canals, introduced into the House of Commons Resolutions to give effect to the Provisional Agreement already arrived at between the Government and the Syndicate, as it was called. Showing, as he was able to do, that the terms (which will be given in detail later on) were far more favourable to the country than any which had been previously proposed, and even than those on which the late Government had attempted to get the work executed, he appealed to the Opposition to unite with his own supporters in bringing this great national work to a triumphant and satisfactory conclusion. But the appeal was in vain. The Canadian Opposition missed, on this occasion, an opportunity of adopting a course, that would have been at once creditable to themselves and advantageous to their country. It must be confessed—as the wearisome pages of the Canadian *Hansard* fully testify—that the captious criticism on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway has not redounded to the reputation of the Opposition as patriots or statesmen; while it cannot be questioned, that the tactics so persistently adopted by them have at times done much abroad to shake the credit and position of the Colony. Canadians have during the past few years been often heard bitterly to say, that the worst enemies of their country and the greatest obstacles to its progress were to be found among their own countrymen. But, without pursuing

pursuing this topic any further, it is enough to say, that the Resolutions above referred to were adopted by large majorities in both Commons and Senate, and that on February 17, 1881, the Canadian Pacific Railway Act received the Royal Assent, and the Company its charter.

Let us now go back six years, and look at the problem then before the organizers of the new Company. Canada's object was to connect the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans by a railway to be made entirely on Canadian soil. This meant the construction of at least 2500 miles of new line. Of this length, the 650 miles between the upper Ottawa River and Port Arthur lay through a district of which all that was known was its extreme unsuitability for railway construction. The fertility of the great prairie plains, stretching for 900 miles westward from the Red River, was theoretically believed in by the few, but was not yet practically demonstrated to the many; while in the West there were three mountain ranges to be crossed, and the dangerous cañons of the British Columbian rivers to be threaded. Through these the three-quarters of a million sterling already spent on surveys had hardly resulted in discovering one feasible line for the passage of the railway to the Pacific. Any estimate of the cost of construction was necessarily little more than conjectural, while the market value to be set upon the Land Grant, upon which it was expected that so much of the capital needed for the work would be raised, was also problematical. Then, as to time—the Government wanted the line completed in ten years; but Mr. Mackenzie had, as we have seen, expressed grave doubts whether the western section, from Lake Superior to the Pacific, could be completed even in fifteen years. Then the Government stipulated, that the line should be worked, as well as made, by any syndicate that undertook its construction. But how was the cost of working it to be met? Had not a high authority lately estimated that cost annually at eight million dollars beyond the earnings? Had it not been officially argued that, since for many years the line would not pay its expenses, the Government must grant a heavy subsidy? The men who, in the face of these awkward facts, and of still more awkward uncertainties, entered upon the task put before them, and who, before appealing to the public for aid, subscribed a million sterling as an evidence of their own faith in the ultimate success of their undertaking, were not wanting in courage.

The conditions of the contract now made were, briefly, as follows. The Government were to complete and hand over to the Company the lines then under construction, amounting in
all

all to 713 miles, and representing approximately an outlay of \$30,000,000. The remainder of the line between Callendar—a geographical expression for the terminus of the yet unfinished Canada Central Railway—and the Pacific coast, an estimated total of at least 1900 miles, was to be completed by the Company before May 1891. The construction was to be equal to the standard of the Union Pacific road. The subsidy was fixed at \$25,000,000 (5,000,000*l.* sterling) and 25,000,000 acres of land; each amount to be given to the Company in stated proportions to the work done on each section. Materials used in the first construction of the road were to be admitted free of duty. The Company's lands, if unsold, were to be free of taxes for twenty years, and its property was to be exempt from taxation. The right of way over lands owned by the Government was to be free. The rates charged by the Company were to be exempt from Government interference until the shareholders were in receipt of 10 per cent. on their stock; and for twenty years no competitive lines were to be allowed to cross the American boundary in Manitoba or the North-West Territories.

With these concessions the Company at once set to work. The first thing done was to secure the Canadian Central Railway, by which Ottawa was reached, and a connection at Brockville with American lines; and the next thing was to acquire from the Quebec Government the line from Ottawa to Montreal. This brought the Canadian Pacific to tidewater; to the chief port and city of the Dominion. But Montreal, important centre as it is, is only a summer port; and arrangements were made for the control of railways giving access to the Atlantic coast. To this we shall return later on. Again, an acquaintance with Canada, or a glance at the map, will show that the main line of the Canadian Pacific does not touch South-Western Ontario, the great district between Lakes Ontario, Erie, and Huron, whose capital is Toronto, and which is, on the whole, the most prosperous section of the Dominion. The manufacturers and merchants of Ontario were naturally looking forward to a large business with the new settlers in the North-West; but it was obvious that, unless the Syndicate gained access to that district, and could exercise some control over its traffic, almost the whole of the latter would pass to Manitoba *viâ* Chicago, and thus be lost to the national railway. An arrangement was accordingly made with those who were then constructing the Ontario and Quebec Railway between Toronto and Montreal; and that line, together with other lines affiliated to it, were leased to the Canadian Pacific.

The Canadian Central Railway not having in 1881 reached
Callendar,

Callendar, it was obviously impossible for the new Company to undertake much work beyond that point. Its chief energies were therefore first directed to the construction of the line from Winnipeg westwards. At the outset two decisions of importance were made: first, to adopt a more southern route across the plains and through the mountains than had formerly been advocated; and secondly, to construct the line in a more substantial manner than the contract required. The former decision would, it was calculated, save between 70 and 100 miles in the through distance, but the latter necessitated the abandonment of all the work done by the Government beyond Winnipeg, at a time when it was supposed that a 'Colonization road' of a cheap character would suffice.

We enter now upon a record of construction that is absolutely without parallel in railway annals. People talk of the 'Prairie section' as if the country were as level as a billiard-table, and that little more was required than to lay the rails on the surface of the soil. But those who have been in the North-West know well that, except between Winnipeg and Portage, there is very little level country. The earthwork on this whole section averaged at least 17,000 cubic yards per mile, and the railway was constructed unusually high above the ground, so as to avoid as far as possible the risk of snow blocks. Work was commenced in May 1881, and by the close of the season 165 miles had been completed. This rate of progress, however, was not fast enough. So in the spring of 1882 a contract was made with Messrs. Langdon and Shepherd, of St. Paul, to complete the line to Calgary, 839 miles from Winnipeg. The work was sublet by them in short sections, according to the ability of the sub-contractors. But in a country where even the stone and timber for construction, as well as the food for men and horses, had to be brought up from an ever-receding base, it was absolutely necessary that the control of the whole should be centred in one management. To provide for the sixty different parties employed, to see that each had its requisite materials, and that work in each year was being done up to time, as well as up to the standard, could only be effected by perfect organization. From an account given by an eye-witness, himself very capable of appreciating what he saw, we extract the following graphic description of the work:—

'The rapidity of construction of this section of the road is without parallel . . .

'As soon as a gang had finished one section they had to move from a hundred to a hundred and fifty miles ahead, where in another six weeks they were tolerably sure to hear the locomotives behind them,

them, and the clanging of the hundred hammers of the track-layers close at their heels.

'In advance of the track-laying party were two bridge gangs, one working at night and the other in the day, and as every stick of timber had to be brought from Rat Portage, 140 miles east of Winnipeg, they were seldom more than eight to ten miles ahead of the track-layers. The timber had to be hauled from the point where it could be unloaded, as near to the end of the track as possible, to the place where it was wanted; and this was generally done in the night, to interfere as little as possible with the other work. Where not a stick of timber nor any preparation for work could be seen one day, the next would show two or three spans of a nicely finished bridge; and twenty-four hours afterwards the rails would be laid, and trains working regularly over it. Following these came the track-laying gang, the most attractive and lively party of the lot, and on which most of the interest of those who visited the work seemed to centre. There were three hundred men and thirty-five teams in this gang. Moving along slowly but with admirable precision, it was beautiful to watch them gradually coming near; everything moving like clockwork, each man in his place knowing exactly his work and doing it at the right time and in the right way. Onward they come, pass on, and leave the wondering spectator slowly behind whilst he is still engrossed with the wonderful sight. The returning locomotive, with her long string of empty cars rushing past him, awakens him from his reverie; and another pushing before her more slowly her heavy load, and taking them up to the front, shows him that where an hour before there was nothing but an upturned sod, two ditches and a low embankment, there is now a finished working railway. The emblem of civilization has passed, the subjugation of the land is accomplished, and that which was the hunting-ground of the Indian and the home of the buffalo yesterday, has gone for ever from his occupation; is Britain to-day, not in name only, but for use, and will probably be occupied within a week by some hopeful and happy British family, who in another season or two will make it a smiling home and the abode of lasting comfort and prosperity. No wonder that it was a sight that hundreds came to see; it was a miracle of progress, the visible growth of an empire; the practical realization of the dream of centuries, as the highway was gradually being laid down destined to conduct the commerce of Europe to that wonderful Orient where a prodigal Nature pours out her riches to supply the wants and luxuries of the world. All that Columbus and Champlain and others had hoped to discover, all that Magellan and Hudson and Franklin had died to find out, all that England and Spain had bestowed their money to explore, and all that France had lavished her energies and sacrificed her heroes to control, was quietly being accomplished by that motley gang and those few locomotives, as the north-west passage to Asia was advancing over these hitherto unserviceable prairies. Each day from twenty to twenty-five heavy twenty-ton cars of rails and fastenings, and from forty to fifty cars of ties and other materials were laid by this busy track-laying

track-laying gang, and nearly all of this had come an average of a thousand miles by rail before it was safely delivered at the "end of the track." *—'Engineering,' April 25, 1884.

The result of this energy was very conspicuous. But in the spring of 1882 disastrous floods occurred in the upper Red River, the only route by which supplies could then reach the North-West; and consequently in the three months ending 30th June less than 70 miles were completed. This comparative inactivity was, however, counterbalanced by the work of the next six months, which, at the rate of over 58 miles a month, produced 349 miles of finished railway. In 1883, 376 miles were completed, and this included the gradual ascent of the Rocky Mountains to within four miles of the summit of the pass. The total advance for the three years was 962 miles, exclusive of 66 miles of sidings. The greatest length of mileage laid in one month was 92 miles, in July 1883; the highest daily average during several weeks was 3.46 miles *per diem* for the eight weeks ending August 5th; and the greatest length laid in one day was 6.38 miles on July 28th in that year.

For the details of that remarkable day's work we again refer to the paper above quoted:—

'There were twenty-four men to handle the iron, that is twelve unloading it from the cars, and twelve to load the trollies. It took the same number to lay it down in the track. The total number of rails laid that day was 2120, or 604 tons. Five men on each side of the front car handed down 1060 rails, 302 tons each gang, whilst the two distributors of angle plates, and bolts, and adjusters of the rails for running out over the rollers, handled 2120 rails, 4240 plates, and 8480 bolts. These were followed by fifteen bolters, who put in on an average 565 bolts each; then thirty-two spikers, with a nipper to each pair, drove 63,000 spikes, which were distributed by four peddlers. The lead and gauge spikers each drove 2120 spikes, which, averaging four blows to each spike, would require 600 blows an hour for 14 hours. There was 16,000 ties or sleepers unloaded from the trains, and reloaded on to waggons by thirty-two men, and thirty-three teams hauled them forward on to the track, averaging seventeen loads of 30 sleepers to each team. On the track eight men unloaded and distributed them, and four others spaced them, two others spaced and distanced the joint ties, and two others arranged and adjusted displaced ties immediately in front of the leading spikers. Four

* An opinion having been expressed, that the then projected line from Suakim to Berber could be completed in four months, provided that the working parties were protected from Osman Digma's attack, the assertion was promptly made by the leading London journal, that it was impossible to construct a railway "telescopically" from one base. And yet in three years these Canadians had just constructed 960 miles "telescopically!"

iron carboys and two horses were used to haul the iron to the front. The first two miles of material were hauled ten miles along the prairie, and the rest from three miles up, as the usual side track gang put in a siding two thousand feet long during the day.'

But dramatic as was the completion of such a length of mileage within three working seasons, the work which had meantime been going on near Lake Superior was no less remarkable. Operations in this case were not confined to the ends of the line, but were carried on at all points to which access could be gained on or from the Lake. From Callendar westwards a more favourable route than had been expected was found; and on several long stretches progress was very rapid. But some of the most difficult and expensive work on the line was required along the northern edge of the Lake itself. The amount of rock-cutting was very heavy, and here, as in the Rocky Mountains, it was found desirable to establish dynamite factories on the spot. It is said that 1,500,000*l.* sterling was expended in dynamite, and that \$10,000,000 were laid out on one 90-mile section of road. Even all through the winter of 1884-5 this work went on, some 9000 men being employed. And well it was for Canada that such energy had been shown and such progress made in that district; for when Riel, in the spring of 1885, raised a rebellion a second time in the far North-West, the citizen soldiers, who flew to arms from all parts of Canada, were hurried forward over that uncompleted but still most valuable piece of railway, and by this means speedily and unexpectedly arrived at the scene of the revolt. The experience of the men could not have been a very pleasant one as, in the early spring and in intense cold, they were carried in contractors' cars over the unballasted road, and had to march over the frozen margin of the lake on arriving at each gap in the unfinished line. But patriotism triumphed over natural obstacles as well as over the rebels. The Pacific Railway, though incomplete, enabled the Government to crush the rebellion promptly: completed, it makes future rebellions impossible. By the time the troops returned in the early summer, the gaps had been finished, and there was a continuous line of rails stretching from Montreal to the summit of the Rocky Mountains.

The summit, we have seen, was reached by the track-layers at the end of December 1884. It was not unreasonable that those, who had crossed the prairie with such speed, should pause awhile at one of the greatest declivities down which a railway has been carried. It was not, however, from exhaustion either of resources or of energy that a short halt was then called, but in order that

one

one more examination might be made of the two passes, by either of which the west slope of the Rockies might be descended. The Howse Pass presented easier gradients, but it would have added thirty miles to the line, while to reach it an altitude of another 1000 feet would have to be surmounted—a very serious matter in the region of snow. So the Kicking Horse Pass, with all its difficulties, was selected. The decision once made, the work went on.

At the watershed is a lake, from either end of which issues a stream—the outlet of one stream is in the Atlantic, *via* Hudson's Bay, the outlet of the other is in the Pacific. The latter stream, the Kicking Horse River, begins its turbulent course through a cleft of crystallized limestone of excessive hardness, and falls 1100 feet in three and a half miles. To complete at once the circuitous route by which this descent could be accomplished without exceeding the gradient of 2.2 per 100 feet, which had been decided upon as the maximum to be allowed in the Mountain section, would have delayed the work beyond that point so many months, that it was determined to construct, at the most difficult part, a temporary line on which a very steep gradient would for the time be admitted. This was accordingly done, and not only the construction trains but those for the regular traffic, after the completion of the line, have ever since been so easily and safely worked up and down this heavy gradient, that it seems doubtful if it will ever be necessary to undertake the longer and easier route. In the 44 miles between the summit of the Rockies and the mouth of the Pass in the valley of the Columbia River, a fall of 2757 feet was accomplished, and in that distance, in addition to other minor streams, the Kicking Horse River was crossed nine times, and, exclusive of tunnels, 1,500,000 cubic yards were excavated, 370,000 of which were of rock. The drilling for this, owing to the impossibility of conveying machinery to the spot, was done by hand. In one part treacherous landslips gave far more trouble than even the hardest rock. It was, therefore, not to be wondered at that, by the 18th of June, the permanent way had only been laid 8 miles west of the summit. By the end of the season, however, there was a satisfactory record of 75 miles of finished line, including a very considerable bridge over the Columbia River.

By the time the work was, in the spring of 1885, resumed at the mouth of the Beaver River, the line in course of construction by the Government from Port Moody to Savona's Ferry, near Kamloops, was approaching completion. The gap between the two ends was only 220 miles, but two mountain ranges, the Selkirks and the Gold Range, had to be surmounted. Through

the latter, the more westerly of the two, Mr. Moberley had some years before, by following the true indication of an eagle's flight, discovered the Eagle Pass; but for many years the magnificent Selkirks had defied the attacks of all surveying parties. To Mr. Moberley attaches the credit of having pointed out that, up a certain branch of the Ille-cille-wait River, the long-looked-for route would, if at all, be discovered; and Major Rogers, the Canadian Pacific Company's engineer, has the honour of being the first man known to have crossed this range, by a pass to which his name has been very properly given, and through which the railway came close upon the heels of its first discoverer.

Even to those who had triumphed over the obstacles of the Kicking Horse Pass, the ascent and descent of the Selkirks presented problems that taxed to the utmost the skill and courage of the engineers. The traveller, who in his luxurious carriage is enjoying some of the most splendid mountain scenery in the world, will also certainly admire the ingenuity and daring of the men who devised and executed the railway along which he is so smoothly carried. While the track-layers from the East were steadily making their way through the Rogers Pass, those from the West were making good progress across the Gold Range; and as the autumn advanced, it became an interesting question when and where the two parties would meet. As expressive, in an American manner, of a huge distance, there was an old saying, that on one of the Dalrymple farms in the Western States the furrow was so long that, when the gang of ploughs returned, they found the harvest ripening from the seed dropped on their first passing. Some idea of the length of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the speed of construction may be formed from the fact, that several miles of permanent way yet remained to be laid in the West, when the first train, that was destined to pass from the St. Lawrence to the Pacific coast, left Montreal. Steadily westward moved the train, steadily onward from both sides proceeded the work; until when the locomotive reached a point in the Eagle Pass, not far from the second crossing of the Columbia River, the two parties were found on November 5th, 1885, face to face, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the exception of one rail, was an accomplished fact. It is significant of the business-like, unostentatious manner, in which this whole work was accomplished, that, whereas the Northern Pacific celebrated the driving of their 'golden spike' by an extravagant excursion, that admittedly cost the Company \$175,000, and probably cost them half as much more, the last spike on the Canadian Pacific was driven by Sir Donald Smith, in the presence of not more than a dozen persons besides

besides those who had been actively employed in laying the permanent way. 'The last spike,' Mr. Van Horne had long before announced, 'will be just as good an iron spike as any on the road; and those who want to see it driven will have to pay full fare.' There was no banquet, no speech-making in the depths of that British Columbian forest; and, having seen the last rail duly laid, the whole party, it is said, quietly went fishing at the next 'likely' stream. But the telegraph—for the wire had throughout kept pace with the railway—flashed the news of the completion of the undertaking far and wide; and a graceful and fitting testimony to the importance of the great work was conveyed to the President of the Company in the following message:—

'I am desired by the Governor-General to acquaint you, that he has received Her Majesty's commands to convey to the people of Canada her congratulations on the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Her Majesty has watched its progress with much interest; and hopes for the future success of a work of such value and importance to the Empire.

'MELGUND, Governor-General's Secretary.'

The contract stipulated for the completion of the line by May 31st, 1891. As we have seen, the last rail was laid on November 5th, 1885, and a regular through train service commenced on June 28th, 1886, or five years in advance of the specified time. When it is remembered that in the West three mountain ranges were traversed, and that in the East, near Lake Superior, the work for more than 100 miles was one of the utmost difficulty, the construction of more than 2200 miles of railroad in four years and a half must be regarded as a most wonderful achievement. That this was not effected by scamping the work is proved, by the independent testimony of English, French, and American engineers who have examined the line, as well as by the formal certificates from time to time given by the Government Engineer. Indeed, it was obviously to the interest of the future proprietors of the railway, that it should be most substantial in construction, and that the gradients should be easy; more especially as in the conveyance of transcontinental mails, passengers, and freight, upon which the future of the line so greatly depends, high speed will necessarily be required. A few statistics will show that this can be easily obtained. The three heavy gradients in the mountains are all contained within three sections of, say, 20 miles each; a concentration that tends to security and economy in the working. Between Montreal and Winnipeg there is no gradient exceeding 53 feet to the mile; between Winnipeg and a point close to the summit

summit of the Rockies there is but one that exceeds 40 feet. Since July, the schedule time between Montreal and Burrard's Inlet has been 136 hours; soon to be reduced to 120 hours; and this again, when the China and Australian mail service commences, will, we are promised, be reduced to 90 hours, or a through speed of 32 miles an hour.

For making fast time, a comparison between the American and Canadian transcontinental railroads is most markedly in favour of the latter. On the Canadian Pacific, as we have seen, the heavy gradients are all within a short length of line; whereas on the lines in the States they are stretched over hundreds of miles. Then, too, in the summit levels to be reached the Canadian line has an immense advantage. The Northern Pacific passes are respectively 3940, 5500, and 5563 feet above the sea; those on the Union and Central Pacific are 6160, 7017, 7835, and 8240 feet; while those on the Canadian Pacific are 1996, 4306 and 5296 feet only.

In actual distance, also, across the Continent, Canada has a considerable advantage: the distance from Montreal to Vancouver being only 2905 miles, while from New York to San Francisco it is 3271 miles. And whereas the various American railways making up the transcontinental line are owned and managed by several distinct companies, the whole traject from the St. Lawrence to the Pacific is under one undivided control. In carrying the Pacific and Atlantic mails to and from Japan, China, and Australia, the advantage of having the line from end to end under one management, so that it can be kept clear, of shorter mileage, and of easier gradients, will continually be felt.

In July 1886, as we have seen, Montreal found itself in easy daily communication with the Pacific coast. But neither Canada nor the Railway Company were satisfied to rest there. The St. Lawrence is only available for summer traffic. True, the Grand Trunk connects Montreal with the harbour of Portland, Maine. But it was deemed essential that the national transcontinental line should have its own independent access to all the Atlantic ports; and especially that the Maritime Provinces of Canada should be brought into closer commercial relations with the rest of the Dominion. To effect this, the Canadian Pacific prepared to bridge the St. Lawrence; and the Government agreed to subsidize a company which undertook, by acquiring such lines as were already available, and by constructing the missing links where needed, to make an almost 'Bee line' between Montreal and the head of the Bay of Fundy, round which it was necessary to go to reach Halifax. This 'Short Line,' or International Railway, is to be completed by the

the winter of 1886-7, and the effect will be to bring the New Brunswick port of St. John, and the Nova Scotian port of Halifax, 279 and 125 miles respectively nearer to Montreal than they are by the present Intercolonial Railway route. The Short Line will, of course, as it passes for some 150 miles through the State of Maine, not be available for troops and war-materials; but commerce fortunately can, by sealed cars and bonding arrangements, afford to disregard political boundaries.

We move quickly now-a-days; and that which was deemed almost one of the world's wonders a few years ago is now thought little of, being superseded by something else which in most instances is better and has also cost far less than its predecessor. In 1860 the Prince of Wales formally opened the Victoria Tubular Bridge at Montreal. Crossing the St. Lawrence at one of its widest points, it is over 9000 feet long; it took more than five years in construction, and cost the Grand Trunk Company, it is said, over six millions of dollars. It was, in its day, a wonderful work. In January 1886 the Canadian Pacific made a contract for the construction of a steel truss-bridge across the St. Lawrence at Lachine. There were to be fifteen stone piers, two of which stand in 27 feet of water running at the rate of about seven knots. There were to be two cantilever spans over the steamboat channel of 408 feet each, two level spans of 270, eight of 240 feet; the whole length being 3454 feet. It was late in April before the contractor for the masonry could get to work at the piers, which he was bound to finish by November 30th. A fortnight in advance of that time he reported the work accomplished. The bridge-builders are close behind the masons, and by the time these words are in print it is expected that the Lachine bridge will be ready for the trains. The cost has not been made public, but it is said not to exceed 250,000*l*.

It is supposed that, at one time, when the work of construction was in progress all along the Canadian Pacific line, as many as 25,000 men were employed upon it. And before leaving this part of the subject, a word ought to be said in praise of the Dominion regulations for keeping the peace in the vicinity of great public works, and also of the Temperance rules which are so honestly and strictly enforced in the North-West. It was only by the help of these efficient rules and regulations, that such a record of unprecedented work was possible, and that peace and order could be, and were, as well maintained at 'the end of the track' as in a quiet English village. The contrast between this state of things in Canada and the rampant rowdiness that marked the construction of the Western railroads in the United

States

States aroused, as well it might, the warm approval of an old Yankee contractor at work on the Canadian Pacific. 'When a man breaks the law here,' he said, 'justice is dealt to him a heap quicker and in larger chunks than he has been accustomed to in the States. I tell you there is a way to do it, and they are doing it here, right from the scratch.'

Although we are not writing for financial readers, still the question will naturally be asked, What has been the outlay on all this gigantic work, what is the capital charge of it to the Company, and is a sufficient rate of interest likely to be provided by the traffic receipts? It is needless to say, that the Company has received substantial aid from the Dominion Treasury, as well as constant moral support from the Government. It is equally needless now to recapitulate the various forms which at times that aid assumed. Suffice it to say that, on one side, the Company's contract is admitted to have been honestly and satisfactorily fulfilled, while on the other it has already repaid to the Government all the money advanced to it in excess of the original subsidy. Each party to the contract is now, therefore, clear of the other.

On the Canadian Pacific proper the capital charge appears to stand at 7,000,000*l.* sterling, in 5 per cent. bonds, placed on the London market by Messrs. Barings, and 13,000,000*l.* in shares. For the latter an annuity of 3 per cent. per annum for ten years, expiring in August 1893, was purchased, out of capital, from the Dominion Government. This is an inalienable payment secured to the shareholders, totally irrespective of any surplus earnings that in the meantime may be available in the form of dividends. The main line, however, and its branches and leased lines are treated by the Company as one system, and as such must be regarded. The total liabilities of the whole system, capitalized, represent about \$135,000,000, say 27,000,000*l.* sterling. (This includes an estimate for the cost of the St. Lawrence bridge, &c.) Taking the total mileage when completed at 4500 miles, this represents exactly \$30,000, or 6000*l.* per mile—certainly an extraordinarily low capital charge. After making as careful an allowance as we can, to cover all the additions made since the last Report was issued, we shall not be far wrong in placing the Fixed Charges for 1887 at \$3,340,000, to cover which the line only requires to earn \$750, say 150*l.*, per mile.* It has hitherto been both ridiculous

* We have said that there is no other railway whose position is so parallel to the Canadian Pacific as to allow of useful comparisons being made between them. But, for whatever they may be worth, we give the following figures. Over a period

ridiculous and impossible to attempt to say, either what have been, or what ought to have been, the earnings *per mile* of an incomplete road of such an exceptional character as the Canadian Pacific. The railway has been incomplete; most of the country through which it passes is undeveloped; much of it is still absolutely without population; and traffic, commerce, everything, has to be created. Above all, the through traffic may be said not to have yet commenced. That a line with all these things against it should already be earning a substantial amount in excess of its Fixed Charges is astonishing, and cannot but be gratifying to its shareholders. These charges for 1886 amount to \$3,110,000, over which the net earnings for the year—the last two months still being estimated—will apparently show a surplus of some \$500,000. As the Fixed Charges will, presumably, not increase for some time to any very large amount, beyond the figure given on the previous page, whereas in the nature of things, with only an ordinary increase in the population and business of the country, the traffic receipts must yearly show a large development, the financial success of the undertaking seems as assured as the construction of the railway.

It is only right to point out, before leaving the financial branch of the subject, that the Company, in the 14,500,000 acres of farming land still left to it in the North-West, possesses a reserve of capital that cannot be estimated to-day at less than 4,500,000*l.* sterling; an estate that costs its owner nothing in taxes, and of which, by a process of 'unearned increment,' the value is year by year rapidly growing. On these matters the Directors of the Company, whose promises and predictions have certainly been hitherto more than fulfilled, may fairly be listened to; and this is what they said to their shareholders in their last Report:—

'In conclusion, the Directors beg to renew their expressions of entire confidence in the success of the enterprise, as a commercial undertaking. With its main line stretching from the Atlantic seaboard to the shores of the Pacific; with its extensive system of branch and connecting lines, enabling it to reach the chief centres of trade in Canada and the Northern United States, with its own steamships on the great Lakes, and all this under one management; with the further great advantage of having only to provide for a total capital charge, including bonds, leases, and ordinary shares, of less than

period of nine years the Grand Trunk net earnings averaged \$1850 per mile. Those of the Great Western of Canada, during six years, \$1165. The Northern of Canada, during the past four years, \$1360, and the Northern Pacific, during the twelve months ending Sept. 1886, at the rate of \$2190 per mile. The Canadian Pacific can pay its fixed charges by earning only \$750 per mile.

\$30,000

\$30,000 per mile, or about one-fifth of that of its principal Canadian competitor, and far below that of any of its American competitors;—with all these advantages, and its superior facilities for attracting business and conducting it economically and efficiently, and with no telegraph, sleeping-car or elevator companies, or any other private interests whatever to sap its revenues, the Canadian Pacific Railway can hardly fail to meet the expectations of its projectors, and to be a source of large and certain profit to its shareholders; and, finally, with the establishment of steamship connections of the best class, both on the Atlantic and the Pacific, it must soon become a powerful factor in the world's commerce.'

The great project, except as regards the extension to the eastern seaboard, being now practically complete, Canada has already begun to reap some return for the sacrifices she has made; and we in England may all the more cordially hope that her expectations may be entirely fulfilled, inasmuch as while working for herself, she has also been working in the interests of the mother country. For herself, she has welded that iron band, without which her political system would disintegrate, but the possession of which promises to render permanent a Confederacy occupying a line four thousand miles in length, of which each section is now within touch, by wire and rail, of the rest. The 'illimitable possibilities' of the Great North-West, with its millions of acres of land producing abundantly the hardest wheat in the world, are now ready for development. There is no longer any reason, why Canada's sons should 'go to the States' to make a new start in life, while there is every reason, why emigration from our own shores should, in preference to being allowed to drift to New York, be judiciously directed to a land over which the British flag waves, and where, in fourteen days from the date of leaving his old home, the emigrant may be turning the furrow on an estate of 160 acres of good wheat land which, at no cost to himself, is, as children say, 'his very own.' The Railway, too, has solved the most difficult problem of the Indian question. If the advent of the locomotive should make the buffalo extinct, like the dodo, there is ample compensation in the fact, that 'Big Bears' and 'Sitting Bulls' are also passing away. The remnants of the races, that have left nothing but piles of bones to mark their long occupation of one of the finest portions of the earth's surface, will now have to exchange the scalping-knife, paint, feathers, and heathen Sun-dances, for ploughs, and clothes, and Christianity.

The ranching industry in Alberta, for which district American cattle-men are deserting their former holdings further South, is rapidly

rapidly growing, and, either 'on hoof' or in refrigerator cars and steamers, its products will, along with 'No. 1 Hard' wheat, soon make their mark in English markets. The eastern foothills of the Rockies are underlaid by vast coal fields, which are already supplying to the settlers on the treeless prairie that cheap fuel, without which the cultivation of those rich acres would be impossible. For lumber, too, about the future supply of which Americans are, not without reason, becoming anxious, the Canadian Pacific opens new districts near Lake Superior, in Keewatin, and, above all, in British Columbia, whose forests are perhaps the finest in the world. The impetus given to mining industry, too, is already most marked: witness the extraordinary copper deposits near Sudbury, the silver ore that is rapidly making Port Arthur a large industrial centre, and the gold wealth of the Kootenay district, now for the first time made accessible. Add to this list the opening of a large reciprocal trade between the Dominion and Australia, and we have the principal results to Canada herself of the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

But there are other and yet more far-reaching results that affect Englishmen all the world over. Whether we regard it in relation to the emigration problem, which must so soon be grappled with; or in connection with a possible Imperial Federation; or, lastly, as a contribution to the safety and defence of the Empire at large, we shall find much to interest us in the Canadian Pacific Railway. In order that this may be understood, it will be necessary to show, by a few details, what a revolution in our old-fashioned ideas of geography and routes this young giant is already effecting.

Canada has hitherto been content with an ocean service that has landed passengers in Quebec very comfortably in ten or eleven days from Liverpool. But, in view of the understood intention of the Imperial Government to subsidize a line of mail steamers on the Pacific between Vancouver and Japan and China, the Dominion Government are now calling for an accelerated Atlantic service, and it seems certain that they will be offered one of a character and speed at least equal to any now running to New York. The result will be that, as Halifax, projecting far into the Atlantic, lies nearer than New York to Queenstown or Plymouth by 600 miles, passengers and mails will be carried from shore to shore in (say) five days and a half. From Halifax those travelling west to the East will be carried to the Pacific coast in another equally short period—say, eleven days from London to Vancouver. A year ago the British Government called for tenders for a mail service between

between Vancouver, Yokohama, and Hongkong. The Canadian Pacific people had, no doubt, already seen the possibilities of that route, and promptly laid before the Imperial authorities a scheme far in advance of what had been asked for. The Postmaster-General having proposed a 10½-knot service, the Company pointed out, that there would be no inducement for the Dominion authorities to secure a fast service on the Atlantic, or for their own trains to cross the Continent at express speed, if time was thus to be thrown away on the Pacific, and they promptly offered an efficient 15-knot service across that ocean. In addition, they proposed to construct their mail steamers under Admiralty supervision in such a manner as to render them convertible at short notice into armed cruisers of a formidable and useful character. This means, that not only will the passage, between England, Yokohama, and Hongkong, which now, *via* Brindisi, occupies 40 to 42 and 32 to 35 days in either case, be reduced to 25 and 31 days respectively; but that the British Government could, in times of danger, command the services of several first-class cruisers in those seas, to which it will always remain difficult to send reinforcements of ships, but on which it is, in view of our more intimate relations with China, and our possibly less harmonious relations with Russia, increasingly important, that England should not, at a critical moment, be weak.

With its Eastern terminus at Halifax, where is a dockyard and the only Imperial station on the Atlantic coast, and its Western at Vancouver, and coal mines at both, the Canadian Pacific becomes a strategic line of no little importance to the Empire. Vancouver is exceptionally well adapted for the purposes which Great Britain requires. The Pacific squadron, having its rendezvous in British Columbia waters, will no longer be cut off from its base, and dependent on a foreign country for even telegraphic communication with its own. The Admiral, lying in Burrard's Inlet, which could itself easily be fortified, is, by a wire that no foreigner handles, in touch with Halifax, Bermuda, and Whitehall, and can draw men and supplies in a week from Halifax, in a fortnight from England itself. Across the Straits lie the coal mines of Nanaimo, whence comes the only good coal on the Pacific coast; and at Esquimalt the Dominion has just completed a large dry dock, and has agreed, it is said, to erect defensive works.

But it is not only our relations with Japan and China that are affected by this railway. In speaking of the possible alternative route to India which it affords, we shall be careful not to overstate its importance, although we know that by some authorities

rities that is estimated very highly. When the Suez Canal was opened, a great part of the commerce of the world, from having been *oceanic*, became again more or less *thalassic*, in Carl Ritter language. The present generation has come to look upon that route as permanent, and such a very large proportion of ships are now built on Canal measurements, that any blocking of 'the ditch' will cause a very serious disturbance to trade. Yet all are agreed that, in the case of a European war, the Canal, even if not blocked, will be nearly useless, because the passage of the Mediterranean, in the face of so many ports from which cruisers could sally, will be so dangerous as to be practically unusable except by strong squadrons.

'In that case we shall revert to the Cape route.' To a certain extent, yes; but, if we are wise, not exclusively. We want to send military and naval supplies of men and materials to India. The transport has first to run the gauntlet of the ports of Western Europe and of vessels lurking about the Western islands. Then the centre of depression of war-clouds moves now-a-days as fast as a south-west gale coming up from the Atlantic, and troops and stores despatched *viâ* the Cape may be sadly needed in Europe before they reach their destination: but, once started, they are gone beyond recall. Granted, however, that the vessel safely reaches Bombay in, say, thirty-three to thirty-five days.

Now let us look at the Canadian route. The North Atlantic should be, and in case of war *must* be, safe for British shipping, if for no other reason than this, that otherwise we shall starve. Neither Russia nor India will then send us a bushel of wheat. Cargoes from New Zealand, California, South America, will be risky ventures. It will be on such wheat-fields and ranches in the North-West as we have been describing, that many-mouthed England will depend for her food supplies; and the food problem promises to be for us one of the most serious in the great wars of the future. Our transports, then, we must assume, will be able safely to run to North America, from whence they will bring back food supplies. Presumably, too, if the war-cloud lowers in the East, a force will have quietly been concentrated at Vancouver. From that point, if need arose, it could either be conveyed to England in a fortnight, or landed in Calcutta in twenty-five days. The Halifax garrison and more troops from England could reach India in five, and eleven days longer, respectively. This is, at least, a second string to our bow; and such second strings are not to be lightly thrown aside. In chronicling the suggestive fact, that the first through-train on the Canadian Pacific carried, in six days from Quebec to

to the Pacific, naval stores for Esquimalt, we do not wish to give undue prominence to the part which this railway can play in actual warfare, for in the peaceful development of commercial intercourse will lie its greatest triumphs. In this respect, fuller use of the Pacific route to Australasia demands attention. Already we are told that a cable is to connect Vancouver with Australia and New Zealand *viâ* Honolulu; and with such an Atlantic service as we have anticipated, and a correspondingly fine service on the Pacific as will undoubtedly follow, one cannot but foresee that Australia will shortly be fortunate in possessing a mail service between London and Adelaide *viâ* Suez, and another between London and Brisbane *viâ* Canada, each covering the distance in about thirty-two days.

The political significance of the construction of the Canadian Pacific and its bearing upon the Egyptian question was grasped by the deputy Whewell Professor of International Law, who more than a year ago wrote:—

‘When the representatives of England come to the discussion of details [about the Suez Canal and Egypt] in the Council Chamber of the Powers, they will now be in a better position than they were a few months ago, owing to an event which is about to happen in a distant portion of the globe. I refer to the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The importance of this railway can hardly be over-estimated from an Imperial point of view.’

And after describing the advantages, which we have touched on above, of the alternative route to India which the railway affords, Mr. Lawrence proceeds:—

‘England’s position with regard to the Egyptian Question has been greatly altered by the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Suez Canal is still of the utmost importance to us, and as far as our commerce with the East is concerned there will in all probability be little difference between the old state of things and the new. But a free passage through the Canal for our transports, at all times and under all circumstances, is by no means so essential to the defence of the Empire as it was a short time ago. We have, therefore, far greater liberty of action in dealing with the other Powers, than we had before. On the one hand, we can with safety accept proposals as to the guardianship of the Canal, which involve some slight and remote risk that measures of police may be enforced against us at a critical time, more from a desire to injure us than because our proceedings cause any real danger to the traffic. Now that we have an alternative route to India, we may be able to purchase other advantages in the settlement of Egyptian affairs by giving our consent to an arrangement concerning the Canal, which prudence would formerly have compelled us to decline. On the other hand, the necessity of coming to an arrangement of some kind is not so great as it was. If the

the Powers should endeavour to take advantage of our position as rulers of India to impose upon us conditions which we deem altogether inadmissible, we can decline to enter into any agreement at all, and leave them to do their worst when a crisis arrives. The continuation of the present state of uncertainty as to the legal position of the Canal is no longer as dangerous as before. A settlement of the difficulty is most desirable, but it is not so essential that we need concede more than we deem just and right in order to get it.*

Much reference has lately been made to the 'immensa majestas Romanæ pacis.' England can hardly have a higher ambition than to secure to the world the benefit of such a peace. And anything that strengthens our position, that by reducing time and distance enables us to concentrate and most efficiently employ our necessarily scattered and somewhat limited forces, and that for commercial advantage as well as for political security brings the component parts of Greater Britain into closer relationship with each other, is an advance towards that most desirable object. Such a contribution to the welfare and unity of the British Empire, and so to peaceful interests throughout the world, has Canada now most obviously made by the construction of her inter-oceanic lines, and by the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

* 'Essays on some disputed questions on Modern International Law.' By T. J. Lawrence, M.A., LL.M., Dep. Whewell Professor, &c. &c., pp. 68-69.

ART. VI.—HOBSON JOBSON: *being a Glossary of Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases and of kindred terms, Etymological, Geographical, and Discursive.* By Colonel Henry Yule, R.E., C.B., LL.D.; and the late Arthur Coke Burnell, Ph.D., C.I.E. London, 1886.

OF all lexicographical achievements there is none likely to be more useful or entertaining than a Glossary, for it comprehends not merely curious, and uncommon or antiquated words applied to special meanings, but also the various uses to which they have been turned by different writers. Glossaries are a form of literary activity which became extremely popular among the Greeks. They were originally remarkable for peculiarities, or even eccentricities, purely etymological; but it was only after the discovery of the New World and the expansion of commerce by sea with the East, that they became of special use to solve the difficulties of semi-educated Europeans, when brought into contact with Asiatics employing unknown and perfected languages. The Indo-Portuguese dialect used in many parts of India for purposes of trade during two centuries, and the Pigeon [*i.e.* 'business'] English of the Chinese ports, are attempts to discover a *lingua franca*, or language intelligible alike to the European and the Asiatic. The adoption of native words, and their gradual incorporation into the English language, was another but somewhat similar process; more difficult to trace, indeed, but affording boundless opportunities to the etymologist. There are numerous and obvious reasons, therefore, why of all glossaries an Anglo-Indian glossary should be the most instructive and interesting, and in a certain sense even the most original. The mercantile enterprise in Asia of the different European nations was necessarily divided into hostile and antagonistic groups; but the impressions that these several national groups received from their intercourse with Asiatics were common to them all, and were conveyed through the indispensable vehicle of speech. Many words and phrases, however, taken from the East established themselves as English colloquialisms after passing through a Portuguese or Dutch form, due to the precedence enjoyed in point of time by the Portuguese and Dutch as pioneers of Oriental commerce.

Colonel Yule represents the ideal glossologist. There is no writer among Anglo-Indians, living or dead, who has attained to his degree of eminence in extent or variety of knowledge, in exactitude of workmanship, in shrewd discrimination of the relative value of the fanciful and the practical, and in the capacity of lucid exposition. The books for which English literature

literature is already indebted to him are gems of the first water. The two best-known of them, his edition of 'The Book of Ser Marco Polo,' and his 'Cathay and the Way Thither,' are standard authorities on the matters with which they deal that can never be displaced or dispensed with. They are, in the first place, works of geography, and as such have placed their author at the head of English geographers. But geographical knowledge is only one among the many remarkable qualities evinced in the production of these books. Colonel Yule shows himself therein to be an etymologist of great skill, and, what does not always follow, of sound sense. His acquaintance with medieval writers, customs, and phrases, is intimate and correct. His literary style and instinct are of a high order, and in accuracy of information he is admitted to be unsurpassed. These are the qualifications of the ideal glossarian, and it may be considered a fortunate coincidence that the author and the subject should have been brought together at such an appropriate and well-timed moment.

If we regard Colonel Yule as the author of 'Hobson-Jobson,' it is intended in no way as a disparagement of his coadjutor for a time, the late Mr. Arthur Coke Burnell. Colonel Yule explains in his Preface the circumstances under which he and Mr. Burnell, who had been engaged in somewhat similar enquiries, agreed to combine their labours, and the volume contains not a few sound observations made direct from the lips or pen of Mr. Burnell; as, for instance, that in which he stated his unwillingness to venture any explanation of South-Indian names owing to their excessive corruption. Mr. Burnell's co-operation covered a period of ten years—from 1872 till his death in 1882—and his surviving collaborator writes thus fully and frankly of his share in the work:—

'In bulk nearly seven-eighths of the book is mine. But Burnell contributed so much of value, so much of the essential; buying, in the search for illustration, numerous rare and costly books which were not otherwise accessible to him in India; setting me, by his example, on lines of research with which I should have else possibly remained unacquainted; writing letters with such fulness, frequency, and interest on the details of the work, up to the summer of his death; that the measure of bulk in contribution is no gauge of his share in the result.'

If Mr. Burnell had lived to see the completion of the edifice to which he contributed, he would have asked no better reward than these remarks.

We cannot commence our notice of the work itself in a better manner

manner than by a few extracts from Colonel Yule's introductory remarks.

'Words of Indian origin have been insinuating themselves into English ever since the end of the reign of Elizabeth and the beginning of that of King James, when such terms as *calico*, *chintz*, and *gingham* had already effected a lodgment in English warehouses and shops, and were lying in wait for entrance into English literature. Such outlandish guests grew more frequent 120 years ago, when soon after the middle of last century the numbers of Englishmen in the Indian services, civil and military, expanded with the great acquisition of dominion then made by the Company, and we meet them in vastly greater abundance now. Vocabularies of Indian and other foreign words in use among Europeans in the East have not unfrequently been printed. Several of the old travellers have attached the like to their narratives, whilst the prolonged excitement created in England a hundred years since by the impeachment of Hastings, and kindred matters, led to the publication of several glossaries as independent works, and a good many others have been published in later days. . . . Our work indeed, in the long course of its compilation, has gone through some modification and enlargement of scope, but hardly such as in any degree to affect its distinctive character, in which something has been aimed at differing in form from any work known to us. In its original conception it was intended to deal with all that class of words which, not in general pertaining to the technicalities of administration, recur constantly in the daily intercourse of the English in India, either as expressing ideas really not provided for by our mother tongue, or supposed by the speakers (often quite erroneously) to express something not capable of just denotation by any English term. A certain percentage of such words has been carried to England by the constant reflux to their native shores of Anglo-Indians, who in some degree imbue with their notions and phraseology the circles from which they had gone forth. This effect has been still more promoted by the currency of a vast mass of literature, of all qualities and for all ages, dealing with Indian subjects, as well as by the regular appearance for many years past of Indian correspondence in English newspapers; insomuch that a considerable number of the expressions in question have not only become familiar in sound to English ears, but have become naturalized in the English language.'

Colonel Yule then proceeds to define the distinctions between different classes of Anglo-Indian words introduced into our language. Some of these, e.g. *curry*, *loot*, *nabob*, *toddy*, he considers have been admitted to full franchise; while another class, composed of such words as *compound*, *batta*, *aya*, *nauteh*, are described as familiar enough to the English ear, though hardly yet received into citizenship. Among words which,

now

now fully assimilated, really originated in the adoption of an Indian word, Colonel Yule gives the three very unlikely-looking names of the boats of a man-of-war, viz. *cutter*, *jolly boat*, and *dingy*. It is true he qualifies the statement by the insertion of the word 'probable.' But even the Oriental origin of some of our nautical terms is not so surprising as the fact, that such vulgar expressions as 'that is the cheese,' and 'I don't care a damn,' are traced to a similar source. The following is Colonel Yule's account of these two words :—

'*Cheese*.—This word is well known to be used in modern English slang for "anything good, first-rate in quality, genuine, pleasant, or advantageous." (*Slang Dictionary*.) And the most probable source of the term is Pers. and H. *chiz* = "thing." For the expression used to be common among young Anglo-Indians, e.g. "My new Arab is the real *chiz*"; "These cheroots are the real *chiz*," i.e. the real thing. The word may have been an Anglo-Indian importation, and it is difficult otherwise to account for it.'

'*Dam*.—Hind. *dam*. Originally an actual copper coin . . . The tendency of denominations of coin is always to sink in value. . . . *Damri* is a common enough expression for the infinitesimal in coin, and one has often heard a Briton in India say: "No! I won't give a *dumree*!" with but a vague notion what a *damri* meant, as in Scotland we have heard, "I won't give a *plack*," though certainly the speaker could not have stated the value of that ancient coin. And this leads to the suggestion, that a like expression, often heard from coarse talkers in England as well as in India, originated in the latter country, and that whatever profanity there may be in the animus there is none in the etymology, when such an one blurts out "I don't care a dam!" i.e. in other words, "I don't care a brass farthing!"

'If the gentle reader deems this a far-fetched suggestion, let us back it by a second. We find in Chaucer ("The Miller's Tale"):

"— ne raught he not a *kerse*," which means, "he recked not a *crass*" (*ne flocci quidem*); an expression which is found also in Piers Plowman:

"Wisdom and witte nowe is not worthe a *kerse*."

'And this, we doubt not, has given rise to that other vulgar expression, "I don't care a curse;" curiously parallel in its corruption to that in illustration of which we quote it.'

The scope and variety of the work may be inferred from these introductory quotations; but in order that the reader may be in a proper position to understand the book, something must be said of its chief title, why it was adopted, as well as its signification. This cannot be done better than in the author's own words :—

'The alternative title ("Hobson-Jobson") which has been given to this book (not without the expressed assent of my collaborator) doubtless requires explanation. A valued friend of the present writer many years ago published a book of great acumen and considerable originality, which he called "Three Essays," with no Author's name; and the resulting amount of circulation was such as might have been expected. It was remarked at the time by another friend that, if the volume had been entitled "A Book by a Chap," it would have found a much larger body of readers. It seemed to me that "A Glossary" or "A Vocabulary" would be equally unattractive, and that it ought to have an alternative title at least a little more characteristic. If the reader will turn to "Hobson-Jobson" in the glossary itself he will find that phrase, though now rare and moribund, to be a typical and delightful example of that class of Anglo-Indian *argot* which consists of Oriental words highly assimilated, perhaps by vulgar lips, to the English vernacular; whilst it is the more fitted to our book, conveying, as it may, a veiled intimation of dual authorship.'

The phrase 'Hobson-Jobson,' we may explain, was the English soldier's corruption of the cry of '*Ya Hosan! Ya Hosain!*' raised at the Mahomedan festival of the Moharram, whence it came to be applied by Tommy Atkins to any native festival or tumasha.

Having described the scope and intention of the work, and dwelt on the exceptional qualifications of the chief author, we pass on to deal with the varied contents of this delightful collection of quaint and old-world information. An accomplished writer and critic of the last generation used to say, that Dr. Johnson's Dictionary, with its illustrative quotations from English authors, was one of his favourite books, which he read at odd times, and always with profit and pleasure. We can say the same of Colonel Yule's Glossary; and we are sure, that no one can take up this work, and open it on any page, without finding instruction, information, and even amusement. It is in fact a library of entertaining knowledge. We shall therefore depart from our usual practice of making any general remarks on the subject, or detailed criticisms of separate parts, and shall confine ourselves, for the most part, to a series of extracts from the book, so as to enable our readers to understand the nature of its contents, and to induce them, as we hope, to procure the work for themselves. But the task is rendered somewhat arduous by an *embarras de richesses*, and the more carefully the volume is read, the more invidious will any special selections appear. We have, however, marked some of the most characteristic descriptions in the glossary, and from these the reader will be able to appreciate its high and extraordinary

ordinary merit. Colonel Yule experienced considerable difficulty in placing limits to his work, and in defining what it should and what it should not contain; and it is inevitable that his reviewer should labour under similar perplexity in arranging his quotations. These may, however, be considered in four groups:—customs of the Eastern world;—terms invented for the purposes of trade;—geographical places; and—phrases or words borrowed from an Indian, Chinese, or other Asiatic source. We do not say that even these comprehensive groups embrace every entry in the columns of 'Hobson-Jobson,' but they at least cover the bulk of them. Among what may be called customs of the Eastern World, we select two very different in the circumstances under which they are exhibited, yet each of them highly typical of Asiatic life and character. In the excitement of the worship of Juggernaut, as in the frenzy of running amuck, the emotional character of the Asiatic is revealed. The conditions of society are too strong for its ordinary manifestations, but a religious festival or the use of a spirituous stimulant suffices to excite the nerves. We take the term Juggernaut first. Colonel Yule shows, that the ceremony was accurately described by Friar Odoric as far back as A.D. 1321; but the first mention of the name is in Gladwin's '*Ayeen*,' about 1590. The term now furnishes our own and foreign literature with a favourite illustration of self-destruction.

'Juggernaut.'—A corruption of the Sanskrit *Jagannātha*, Lord of the Universe, a name of Krishna, worshipped as Vishnu at the famous shrine of Puri in Orissa. The image so called is an amorphous idol, much like those worshipped in some of the South Sea Islands, and it has been plausibly suggested (we believe first by General Cunningham) that it was in reality a Buddhist symbol which has been adopted as an object of Brahminical worship, and made to serve as the image of a god. The idol was and is annually dragged forth in procession on a monstrous car, and, as masses of excited pilgrims crowded round to drag or accompany it, accidents occurred. Occasionally also persons, sometimes sufferers from painful diseases, cast themselves before the advancing wheels. The testimony of Mr. Stirling, who was for some years collector of Orissa in the second decade of this century, and that of Dr. W. W. Hunter, who states that he has gone through the MS. archives of the province since it became British, show that the popular impression in regard to the continued frequency of immolations on these occasions—a belief which has made Juggernaut a standing metaphor—was greatly exaggerated. The belief indeed in the custom of such immolation had existed for centuries, and the rehearsal of these or other cognate religious suicides at one or other of the great temples of the Peninsula, founded partly on fact and partly on popular report, finds a place in almost every old narrative

narrative relating to India. The really great mortality from hardship, exhaustion, and epidemic disease which frequently ravaged the crowds of pilgrims on such occasions, doubtless aided in keeping up the popular impressions in connection with the Juggernaut festival.

If the worship of Juggernaut affords one instance of Eastern excitability under the influence of religious excess, the habit of running 'amuck' is equally typical of another form of mental agitation, and in this latter the poor Malay coolie is shown to have a prototype in the lordly Rajput. Colonel Yule's analysis of it will not be considered less interesting than his remarks on Juggernaut:—

'*A Muck, to run.*—There is, we believe, no room for doubt that, to us at least, this expression came from the Malay countries, where both the phrase and the practice are still familiar. Some valuable remarks on the phenomenon, as prevalent among the Malays, were contributed by Dr. Oxley of Singapore to the "*Journal of the Indian Archipelago*" (vol. iii. p. 532). The word is by Crawford ascribed to the Javanese, and this is his explanation. "*Amuk, An a-muck, to run a-muck, to tilt, &c.*" Marsden says that the word rarely occurs in any other than the verbal form *mengamuk*, to make a furious attack. There is reason, however, to ascribe an Indian origin to the term, whilst the practice, apart from the term, is of no rare occurrence in Indian history. Thus Tod records some notable instances in the history of the Rajputs. In one of these (1634) the eldest son of the Raja of Marwar ran a muck at the Court of Shah Jahan, failing in his blow at the Emperor, but killing five courtiers of eminence before he fell himself. Again, in the last century, Bijai Singh, also of Marwar, bore strong resentment against the Talpura prince of Hyderabad, Bijar Khan, who had sent to demand from the Rajput tribute and a bride. A Bhatti and a Chondawat offered their services for vengeance and set out for Sind as envoys. Whilst Bijar Khan read their credentials, muttering "No mention of the Bride!" the Chondawat buried a dagger in his heart, exclaiming, "This for the bride!" "And this for the tribute!" cried the Bhatti, repeating the blow. The pair then plied their daggers right and left, and twenty-six persons were slain before the envoys were hacked to pieces. But it is in Malabar that we trace the apparent origin of the Malay term in the existence of certain desperadoes who are called by a variety of old travellers *amouchi* or *amuco*. The nearest approach to this that we have been able to discover is the Malayalam *amar kkan*, a warrior (from *amar*, fight, war). One of the special applications of this word is remarkable in connection with a singular custom of Malabar. After the Zamorin had reigned twelve years, a great assembly was held at Tirunavayi, when that Prince took his seat surrounded by his dependents, fully armed. Any one might then attack him, and the assailant, if successful in killing the Zamorin, got the throne. This had often happened. In 1600, thirty such assailants were killed in the enterprise. Now these men were called
amar-kkar

amar-kkar (pl. of *amar kkan*). These men evidently ran a-muck in the true Malay sense, and quotations [given by Col. Yule] show other illustrations from Malabar which confirm the idea that both name and practice originated in Continental India . . . The phrase has been thoroughly naturalized in England since the days of Dryden and Pope.

Of words which owed their origin to the circumstances of the trade or intercourse between Europeans and Asiatics, the term *chop* is a useful typical instance. We prefer it to *dustick*, the meaning of which is very similar, because it may still be considered in use, although not so much as before the treaties with China. *Chop* is also more suitable for quotation, because it is treated quite exhaustively in this glossary.

'*Chop*.—Properly a seal-impression, stamp or brand; Hind. *chhāp*; the verb (*chhāpnā*) being that which is now used in Hindustani to express the art of printing (books). The word *chhāp* seems not to have been traced back with any certainty beyond the modern vernaculars. It has been thought possible (at least till the history should be more accurately traced) that it might be of Portuguese origin. For there is a Portuguese word *chapa*, a thin plate of metal which is no doubt the original of the old English chape for the metal plate on the sheath of a sword or dagger . . . The word *chop* is hardly used now among Anglo-Indians in the sense of seal or stamp. But it got a permanent footing in the "Pigeon English" of the Chinese ports, and thence has come back to England and India in the phrase first-chop, i.e. of the first brand or quality. The word *chop* (*chāp*), is adopted in Malay, and has acquired the specific sense of a passport or license. The word has also obtained a variety of applications, including that just mentioned, in the *lingua franca* of foreigners in the China seas. Van Braam applies it to a tablet bearing the Emperor's name, to which he and his fellow-envoys made *kotow* on their first landing in China. Again, in the same jargon, a *chop* of tea means a certain number of chests of tea all bearing the same brand. Chop-houses are Customs stations on the Canton river, so called from the chops or seals used there. Chop-dollar is a dollar chopped or stamped with a private mark as a guarantee of its genuineness. (Dollars similarly stamped had currency in England in the first quarter of this century, and one of the present writers can recollect their occasional occurrence in Scotland in his childhood.) The grand chop is the port clearance granted by the Chinese Customs when all dues have been paid. All these have obviously the same origin; but there are some other uses of the word in China not so easily explained, e.g. *chop*, for "a hulk"; *chop-boat*, for a lighter or cargo-boat.'

Hardly inferior in interest to the official phrases invented or employed for the purposes of trade intercourse are the names of

articles

articles of food, fruit, &c., such as *arrack*, *ananas*, *mango*, *candy-sugar*, &c. The word last-named people generally would hardly suspect to have an Asiatic origin, but Colonel Yule has no difficulty in disposing of its alleged derivation from Candia, and in showing that it must come from the Sanscrit *Khanda*, broken, a word also applied in various compounds to granulated and candied sugar. *Arrack* has a very curious history, going back to Shah Rokh's embassy to China, at the beginning of the fifteenth century:—

'*Arrack*, or *Rack*.—This word is the Arabic *arak*, properly "perspiration," and then first, the exudation, a sap drawn from the date palm (*arak al-tamar*); secondly, any strong drink, "distilled spirit," "essence," &c. But it has spread to very remote corners of Asia. Thus it is used in the forms *ariki* and *arki* in Mongolia and Manchuria, for spirit distilled from grain. In India it is applied to a variety of common spirits; in South India, to those distilled from the fermented sap of sundry palms; in East and North India, to the spirit distilled from cane molasses, and also to that from rice. The Turkish form of the word *raki* is applied to a spirit made from grape-skins, and in Syria and Egypt to a spirit flavoured with aniseed, made in the Lebanon. There is a popular or slang French word *riquiqui*, for brandy, which appears also to be taken from *araki*.'

Ananas furnishes the opportunity for a long and learned disquisition on the subject of pine-apples, which the author considers were introduced into India and China from America, notwithstanding their early mention in the former countries and the neighbouring islands.

'Their diffusion in the East was early and rapid. To one who has seen the hundreds of acres covered with pine-apples in the islands adjoining Singapore, or their profusion in a seemingly wild state in the valleys of the Kasia country on the eastern borders of Bengal, it is hard to conceive of this fruit as introduced in modern times from another hemisphere. But, as in the case of tobacco, the name bewrayeth its true origin, whilst the large natural family of plants to which it belongs is exclusively American. . . . Pine-apples used to cost a *pardao* (a coin difficult to determine the value of in those days), when first introduced in Malabar, says Linschoten; but "now there are so many grown in the country that they are very good, cheape." Athanasius Kircher, in the middle of the seventeenth century, speaks of the *ananas* as produced in great abundance in the Chinese provinces of Canton, Kiangsu, and Fuhkien. In Ibn Muhammad Wali's "History of the Conquest of Assam," written in 1662, the pine-apples of that region are commended for size and flavour. In the last years of the preceding century, Carletti (1599) already commends the excellent *ananas* of Malacca. But even some
twenty

twenty or thirty years earlier the fruit was grown profusely in Western India, as we learn from Chr. d'Acosta (1578). And we know from the Ain that (about 1590) the *ananas* was habitually served at the table of Akbar, the price of one being reckoned at only 4 *dams*, or one-tenth of a rupee; whilst Akbar's son Jahangir states that the fruit came from the seaports in the possession of the Portuguese.'

We may conclude our references to this class of subjects with the word *mango*, which is probably the fruit alluded to by Theophrastus as having caused dysentery in the army of Alexander:—

'*Mango*.—The royal fruit of the *Mangifera indica*, when of good quality, is one of the richest and best fruits in the world. The original of the word is Tamil, *man-kay*—i.e. man-fruit (the tree being *mamarum*, man-tree). The Portuguese formed from this *manga*, which we have adopted as *mango*. The tree is wild in the forests of various parts of India; but the fruit of the wild tree is uneatable. The word has sometimes been supposed to be Malay; but it was in fact introduced into the Archipelago, along with the fruit itself, from South India. Rumphius traces its then recent introduction into the islands, and says that it is called (*Malaicè*) "*mannga vel vulgo Manga et Mampelaam*." The last word is only the Tamil *Māmpalam*—i.e. *mān*-fruit again.'

There are a good many words which people do not at once associate with the East, such as *cot*, *Cossack* and *loot*, which are derived from Asiatic languages, and others again like *aya*, that every one accepts as Indian, and yet that have a European origin. *Cot* is shown to be clearly the Indian term for a light bedstead; *Cossack* is 'a predatory horseman,' in the history of Hindostan; and *loot* is from the Hindostani *lūt*, plunder. On the other hand, *ayah*, which ninety-nine persons out of a hundred would accept as genuine Indian, is really a Portuguese term derived from *aia*, a nurse or governess. But a still more curious case of the derivation of a word in common use from Asia is that of *chicane*.

'*Chicane, chicanery*.—These English words, signifying pettifoggery, captious contention, taking every possible advantage in a contest, have been referred to Spanish *chico*, little, and to French *chic, chicquet*, a little bit, as by Mr. Wedgwood in his "Dictionary of English Etymology." But there can be little doubt that the words are really traceable to the game of *chaugān*, or horse-golf. This game is now well known in England under the name of polo. But the recent introduction under that name is its second importation into Western Europe. For in the Middle Ages it came from Persia to Byzantium, where it was popular, under a modification of its Persian name (verb *τελευταίνειν*, playing ground *τελευτιστήριον*), and from Byzantium it passed as a pedestrian game to Languedoc, where it was called by a further modification *chicane* (see Ducange, &c.). The analogy of certain

certain periods of the game of golf suggests how the figurative meaning of *chicaner* might arise in taking advantage of the petty accidents of the surface. And this is the strict meaning of *chicaner* as used by military writers. Ducange's idea was that the Greeks had borrowed both the game and the name from France, but this is evidently erroneous. He was not aware of the Persian *chaugan*. But he explains well how the tactics of the game should have led to the application of its name to "those tortuous proceedings of pleaders which we old practitioners call *barres*." The indication of the Persian origin of both the Greek and French words is due to W. Ouseley and to Quatremère. . . . The game is now quite extinct in Persia and Western Asia, surviving only in certain regions adjoining India as is specified under Polo. But for many centuries it was the game of kings and courts over all Mahommedan Asia. The earliest Mahommedan historians represent the game of *chaugan* as familiar to the Sassanian kings; Ferdusi puts the *chaugan*-stick into the hands of Siawush, the father of Kai Khusrû or Cyrus; many famous kings were devoted to the game, among whom may be mentioned Nuruddin the Just, Atabek of Syria, and the great enemy of the Crusaders. He was so fond of the game, that he used (like Akbar in after days) to play it by lamp-light, and was severely rebuked by a devout Mussulman for being so devoted to a mere amusement. Other zealous *chaugan* players were the great Saladin, Jalaluddin Mankbarni of Khwarism, and Malik Bibars, Marco Polo's "Bendoequedar Soldan of Babylon," who was said more than once to have played *chaugan* at Damascus and at Cairo within the same week. . . . It is not known when the game was conveyed to Constantinople, but it must have been not later than the beginning of the eighth century. The fullest description of the game as played there is given by Johannes Cinnamus, who does not, however, give the barbarian name.'

Another class of words present themselves for consideration in the names of native or Anglo-Indian buildings or portions of them, such as *compound*, *balcony*, *pagoda*, and *bungalow*. *Compound* is the enclosed ground, whether garden or waste, which surrounds an Anglo-Indian house. It seems to have been introduced into India from the English factories in the Archipelago where, it will be remembered, the settlements of this country dated from an earlier period than those on the mainland; but whether it was derived from the Malayan word '*kampung*,' which means identically the same thing, and whether '*kampung*' itself was an original Malayan word, or one borrowed from the Portuguese *campo*, seems to be open to very considerable doubt. *Balcony* is given in this Glossary in order to show how extremely doubtful its Oriental etymology is, and *pagoda* is treated under each of its triple significations, an idol temple, an idol, and a coin of South India. Its etymology is also surrounded

surrounded with much uncertainty, but on the whole there seems a good deal of reason to connect its origin with some South Indian form of the Sanscrit *Bhagavat*, holy or divine. *Bungalow* is a word of a different character, and there is no doubt that it derives its name from Bengal, being a house built in Bengal fashion. We append Colonel Yule's description:—

'*Bungalow*. Hind. and Mahr. *bangla*.—The most usual class of house occupied by Europeans in the interior of India; being on one story and covered with a pyramidal roof, which in the normal bungalow is of thatch, but may be of tiles without impairing its title to be called a bungalow. Most of the houses of officers in Indian cantonments are of this character. In reference to the style of a house, *bungalow* is sometimes employed in contradistinction to the (usually more pretentious) *pukka house*, by which latter term is implied a masonry house with a terraced roof. A *bungalow* may also be a small building of the type which we have described, but of temporary material, in a garden on a terraced roof for sleeping in, &c., &c. The word has been adopted also by the French in the East, and by Europeans generally in Ceylon, China, Japan, and the coast of Africa. Wilson writes the word, *bangla*, giving it as a Bengali word, and as probably derived from *Banga* = Bengal. This is fundamentally the etymology mentioned by Bishop Heber, in his "Journal," and that etymology is corroborated by our first quotation from a native historian, as well as by that from F. Buchanan. It is to be remembered that in Hindustan proper the adjective "of or belonging to Bengal" is constantly pronounced as *bangala* or *bangla*. Thus, one of the eras used in Eastern India is distinguished as the *Bangla* era. The probability is that, when Europeans began to build houses of this character in Behar and Upper India, these were called *Bangla* or Bengal fashion-houses; that the name was adopted by the Europeans themselves and their followers, and so was brought back to Bengal itself, as well as carried to other parts of India.'

The volume necessarily contains much lighter matter, such as, for instance, the sobriquets of the civilians of the three Presidencies. Those of Bengal were called *Qui-His*, from their mode of summoning servants by saying *Koi hai?*—Is any one there?; of Bombay *Ducks*, which seems to have had an honourable origin in *duces*; and of Madras *Mulls*, a contraction from Mulligatawny. These epithets are not calculated to give one a high idea of Anglo-Indian wit. The early Anglo-Indians took life *au grand sérieux*, and this is not to be wondered at, when we consider the isolation of their position, and the serious dangers to which they were exposed, not merely by the hostility of the natives, but from the diseases attendant on the climate. Some idea of the inconvenience and peril of the latter may be gathered from the descriptions of *prickly heat*, *beriberi*, and *mort de chien*, contained in this glossary.

'*Prickly-heat*.

'*Prickly-heat*.—A troublesome cutaneous rash in the form of small red pimples, which itch intolerably. It affects many Europeans in the hot weather. Fryer (pub. 1698), alludes to these 'fiery pimples,' but gives the disease no specific name. Natives sometimes suffer from it, and (in the south) use a paste of sandal wood to alleviate it. Sir Charles Napier in Sind used to suffer much from it, and we have heard him described as standing, when giving an interview during the hot weather, with his back against the edge of an open door, for the convenience of occasional friction against it.'

Beriberi is a far more serious malady, which occasionally breaks out among Europeans, although generally confined to natives. A recent outbreak of the epidemic among the Portuguese garrison of Goa lends further interest to the subject.

'*Beriberi*.—An acute disease, obscure in its nature and pathology, generally but not always presenting dropsical symptoms, as well as paralytic weakness and numbness of the lower extremities, with oppressed breathing. In cases where debility, oppression, anxiety, and dyspnoea, are extremely severe, the patient sometimes dies in six to thirty hours. Though recent reports seem to refer to this disease as almost confined to natives, it is on record that in 1795, in Trincomalee, 200 Europeans died of it. The word has been alleged to be Singhaliese *beri*, "debility." This kind of reduplication is really a common Singhaliese practice. It is also sometimes alleged to be a West Indian negro term; and other worthless guesses have been made at its origin. The Singhaliese origin is on the whole most probable. In the quotations from Bontius and Bluteau, the disease described seems to be that formerly known as *barbiers*. Some authorities have considered these diseases as quite distinct, but Sir Joseph Fayrer, who has paid attention to *beriberi*, and written upon it, regards *barbiers* as the dry form of *beriberi*; and Dr. Lodewijks says briefly, that "the Barbiers of some French writers is incontestably the same disease." (On this it is necessary to remark that the use of the term Barbiers is by no means confined to French writers.) The disease prevails endemically in Ceylon and in Peninsular India, in the coast tracks, and up to 40 or 60 miles inland; also in Burma and the Malay region, including all the islands at least as far as New Guinea, and also Japan, where it is known as *kakké*. It is very prevalent in certain Madras Jails. The name has become somewhat old-fashioned, but it has recurred of late years, especially in hospital reports from Madras and Burma. It is frequently epidemic, and some of the Dutch physicians regard it as infectious.'

But neither *prickly heat* nor *beriberi* can claim the same importance as *mort de chien*, under which term is disguised the fatality we term cholera. As will be seen from the following description, this has nothing to do with the old phrase in our literature,

literature, 'to die the death of a dog,' appropriate as it might seem to the most terrible of Asiatic scourges.

'*Mort de chien*.—A name for cholera in use, more or less, up to the end of last century, and the former prevalence of which has tended probably to the extraordinary and baseless notion that epidemic cholera never existed in India till the Governorship of the Marquis of Hastings. The word in this form is really a corruption of the Portuguese *mordexim*, shaped by a fanciful French etymology. The Portuguese word again represents the Konkani and Mahratti *modāchi*, *modāhi*, or *modwashī*, cholera, from a Mahr. verb *modnen*, "to break up, to sink" (as under infirmities, in fact to collapse).'

After a large number of quotations, Colonel Yule continues :—

'These quotations show that cholera, whether as sporadic disease or as epidemic, is no new thing in India. Almost in the beginning of the Portuguese expeditions to the East we find apparent examples of the visitations of this terrible scourge, though no precise name be given in the narratives. Thus we read in the Life of Giovanni da Empoli, an adventurous young Florentine who served with the Portuguese, that, arriving in China in 1517, the ships' crews were attacked by a *pessima malatia di frusso* (virulent flux), of such kind that there died thereof about seventy men, and among these Giovanni himself, and two other Florentines. Correa says that, in 1503, 20,000 men died of a like disease in the army of the Zamorin. We have given Correa's description of the terrible Goa pest of 1543, which was most evidently cholera. Madras accounts, according to Macpherson, first mention the disease at Arcot in 1756, and there are frequent notices of it in that neighbourhood between 1763 and 1787. The Hon. R. Lindsay speaks of it as raging at Sylhet in 1781 after carrying off a number of the inhabitants of Calcutta. It also raged that year at Ganjam, and out of a division of 5000 Bengal troops, under Colonel Pearse, who were on the march through that district, 1143 were in a few days sent into hospital, whilst "death raged in the camp with a horror not to be described." The earliest account from the pen of an English physician is by Dr. Paisley, and is dated, Madras, Feb. 1774. In 1783 it broke out at Hardwar Fair, and it is said in less than eight days to have carried off 20,000 pilgrims. The paucity of cases of cholera among European troops in the returns up to 1817 is ascribed by Dr. Macnamara to the way in which facts were disguised by the current nomenclature of disease. It need not perhaps be denied that the outbreak of 1817 marked a great recrudescence of the disease. But it is a fact that some of the more terrible features of the epidemic, which are then spoken of as quite new, had been prominently described at Goa nearly three centuries before.'

Among native titles we may take as typical of the rest *Bahadur* and *Dewaun*, the former a designation of honour under the early Mongols, and continued and indeed expanded by the English

English Government, and the latter a term which is generally accepted in Europe as identical with Prime Minister. *Bahadur* or *Bahaudur* is a word that takes us back to the Baturus that surrounded Genghis Khan, at the same time that it keeps in our mind the crowd of present aspirants to this honour among the native officials of the Indian Government. Colonel Yule has naturally a good deal to say on both sides of the subject.

'*Bahaudur*.—Hind. Bahādur, "a hero or champion." It is a title affixed commonly to the names of European officers in Indian documents, or when spoken of ceremoniously by natives, in which use it may be compared with the "gallant officer" of Parliamentary courtesy, or the *Illustriissimo Signore* of the Italians. It was conferred as a title of honour by the Great Mogul, and by other native princes. Thus it was particularly affected at the end of his life by Hyder Ali, to whom it had been given by the Raja of Mysore. *Bahadur* and *Sirdar Bahadur* are also the official titles of members of the second and first classes respectively of the Order of British India, established for native officers of the army in 1837. . . . In Anglo-Indian colloquial parlance the word denotes a haughty or pompous personage exercising his brief authority with a strong sense of his own importance, a *don* rather than a swaggerer. Thackeray, who derived from his Indian birth and connexions a humorous felicity in the use of Anglo-Indian expressions, has not omitted this serviceable word. In that brilliant burlesque, "*The Memoirs of Major Gahagan*," we have the Mahratta traitor, *Bobachee Bahauder*. It is said also that Mr. Canning's malicious wit bestowed on Sir John Malcolm, who was not less great as a talker than as a soldier and statesman, the title not included in the Great Mogul's repertory of *Bahauder Jaw*. *Bahadur* is one of the terms which the hosts of Chingiz Khan brought with them from the Mongol steppes. . . . In Sanang Sitzen's poetical annals of the Mongols, the word is written *Baghatur*, whence in Russian *Bagatir* still survives, a memento probably of the Tartar domination, meaning a hero or champion.'

If *Bahadur* has a semi-military meaning and in its origin one closely associated with the profession of arms, *devaun* or *diwan* is equally identified with a civilian career and the pursuit of peace. Although it is very likely that bahadurs have fallen from their pristine eminence, the title of *diwan* would still be a misnomer if applied to a member, of not merely the military profession, but of a notoriously warlike race. Salar Jung was a *diwan*. Jung Bahadur of Nepaul was, as became a Goorkha, a *bahadur*.

'*Devaun*.—The chief meanings of this word in Anglo-Indian usage are: (1) Under the Mahomedan Governments which preceded us, "the head financial minister, whether of the State or a province . . . charged in the latter with the collection of the revenue, the remittance

remittance of it to the imperial treasury, and invested with extensive judicial powers in all civil and financial causes" (Wilson). It was in this sense that the grant of the Dewanny to the E. I. Company in 1765 became the foundation of the British Empire in India. (2) The prime minister of a native state. (3) The chief native officer of certain Government establishments, such as the Mint, or the native manager of a Zemindary. (4) (In Bengal) A native servant in confidential charge of the dealings of a house of business with natives, or of the affairs of a large domestic establishment. These meanings are perhaps all reducible to one conception, of which "Steward" would be an appropriate expression. But the word has had many other ramifications of meaning, and has travelled far. The Arabic *diwan* is, according to Lane, an Arabicised word of Persian origin (though some hold it for pure Arabic), and is in original meaning nearly equivalent to Persian *daftar*, i.e., a collection of written leaves or sheets (forming a book for registration), hence "a register of accounts," a "register of soldiers or pensioners," a register of the rights or dues of the State, or relating to the acts of government, the finances and the administration; also any book, and especially a collection of the poems of some particular poet. It was also applied to signify "an account," then a writer of accounts; a "place of such writers of accounts;" also "a council court or tribunal;" and in the present day "a long seat formed of a mattress laid along the wall of a room with cushions raised or on the floor;" or "two or more of such seats." Thus far (in this paragraph) we abstract from Lane. The Arabian historian Biladuri (c. 860) relates as to the first introduction of the *diwan*, that when Omar was discussing with the people how to divide the enormous wealth derived from the conquests in his time, Walid bin Hisham bin Moghaira said to the caliph, "I have been in Syria, and saw that its kings make a *diwan*; do thou the like." So Omar accepted his advice, and sent for two men of the Persian tongue, and said to them, "Write down the people according to their rank." We must observe that in the Mahomedan states of the Mediterranean, the word *diwan* became especially applied to the custom house, and thence passed into the Romance language as *aduana*, *douane*, *dogana*, &c. Littré, indeed, avoids any decision as to the etymology of *douane*, &c. And Hyde derives *dogana* from *docan* (i.e., Pers., *dukan*, *officina*, a shop). But such passages as that quoted from Ibn Jubair, and the fact that in the mediæval Florentine treaties with the Mahomedan powers of Barbary and Egypt, the word *diwan* in the Arabic texts constantly represents the *dogana* of the Italian seem sufficient to settle the question. . . . At a later period the word was re-imported into Europe in the sense of a hall furnished with Turkish couches and cushions, as well as a couch of this kind. Hence we get *cigar-divans* et hoc genus omne.

This last quotation shows the variety of uses to which the same word may be turned in an Eastern language, as well as the linguistic

linguistic indebtedness of European tongues to those of Asia. Instances of this might be multiplied, but would be beside our main purpose, which is merely to show the multifarious interest of the contents of this volume. Articles of clothing necessarily occupy a good deal of the learned editor's attention, from 'the white jacket' of the earlier settlers and the *pyjamas* of the present day, to the *chogas*, *sarongs*, and *sirdrars* of native costume. We, however, select as a specimen of this class of words one which has long been a stumbling-block to etymologists. The following clear exposition of the different attempts to fix its true origin will do much to elucidate a vexed question :—

'*Turban*.—Some have supposed this well-known English word to be a corruption of the Pers. Hind. *sirband* (head-wrap). This is, however quite inconsistent with the history of the word. Wedgwood's suggestion that the word may be derived from the French, *turbin*, a whelk, is equally to be rejected. It is really a corruption of one which, though it seems to be out of use in modern Turkish, was evidently used by the Turks when Europe first became familiar with the Ottomans and their ways. This is set forth in the quotation from Zedler's 'Lexicon,' which is corroborated by those from Rycant and from Galland, &c. The proper word was apparently *dulband*. Some modern Persian dictionaries give the only meaning of this as "a sash." But Meninsky explains it as "a cloth of fine white muslin; a wrapper for the head;" and Vullers also gives it this meaning as well as that of a "sash or belt." In doing so he quotes Shakespear's dictionary, and marks the use as "Hindustani-Persian." But a merely Hindustani use of a Persian word could scarcely have become habitual in Turkey in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The use of *dulband* for a turban was probably genuine Persian adopted by the Turks. Its etymology is apparently from Arab, *dul*, "volvere," admitting of application to either a girdle or a head-wrap. From the Turks it passed into the forms, *Tulipant*, *Tolliban*, *Turbant*, &c., into European languages. And we believe that the flower *tulip* also has its name from the resemblance to the old Ottoman turban.'

The ideal Eastern garb is composed of costly materials, as well as arranged in strange forms, and the silks and satins were hardly less coveted by the needy adventurers of Europe in the Middle Ages than the gems and spices of the Indies. The articles themselves came westward under many strange forms of nomenclature, of which 'satin' itself is not the least peculiar, although we incline to believe Colonel Yule's derivation, from the medieval port of Zayton, is the correct explanation of the difficulty. But perhaps the following account of *kincob* affords the most curious instance of etymological ingenuity :—

'*Kincob*.

Kincob.—Gold brocade; Pers. Hind. *kimkhwab*. The English is perhaps from the Gujarati, as in that language the last syllable is short. This word has been twice imported from the East. For it is only another form of the mediæval name of an eastern damask or brocade *cammocca*. This was taken from the mediæval Persian and Arabic forms, *kamkha*, or *kimkhwa*, "damasked silk," and seems to have come to Europe in the thirteenth century. F. Johnson's Dictionary distinguishes between *kamkhā*, damask silk of one colour, and *kimkha*, damask silk of different colours. And this again, according to Dozy quoting Hoffmann, is originally a Chinese word, *kin-kha*, in which doubtless *kin*, gold, is the first element. *Kim* is the Fuhkien form of this word; qu. *kim-hoa*, gold flower? We have seen *kimkhwab* derived from Pers. *kam-khwab*, "less sleep," because such cloth is rough and prevents sleep!

As Colonel Yule exclaims, 'this is a type of many etymologies!' The simpler an etymological deduction the more likely is it to prove accurate; and in tangible objects it is generally possible, after tracing a word back through the different phases of its spelling, to arrive at the truth as to its meaning and a satisfactory explanation of its etymology. The word *demijohn*, affords an extremely curious case in point:—

Demijohn.—A large glass bottle holding twenty or thirty quarts or more. The word is not Anglo-Indian, nor is the thing; but it is introduced here because it has been supposed to be the corruption of an Oriental word, and suggested to have been taken from the name of *Damaghan* in Persia. This looks plausible (compare the Persian origin of *carboy*, which is another name for just the same thing), but no historical proof has yet been deduced, and it is doubted by Mr. Marsh in his Notes on Wedgwood's Dictionary, and by Dozy. Niebuhr, however, uses the word as an Oriental one, and in a note on the fifth edition of Lane's "Modern Egyptians," 1860, p. 149, there is a remark quoted from Hammer-Purgstall as to the omission, from the detail of domestic vessels, of two whose names have been adopted in European languages, viz. the *garra* or *jarra*, a water-jar, and the *demigan* or *demijan*, *la dame jeanne*. The word is undoubtedly known in modern Arabic. The *Mohit* of B. Bistani, the chief modern native lexicon, explains *Damijana* as "a great glass vessel, big-bellied and narrow-necked, and covered with wicker work, a Persian word." The vulgar use the forms *damajana* and *damanjana*. *Dame-jeanne* appears in P. Richelet, Dict. de la langue Franç. (1759), with this definition "Nom que les matelots donnent à une grande bouteille couverte de natte." It is not in the great Castilian Dict. of 1729, but it is in those of this century, e.g. Dict. of the Span. Academy, ed. 1869, "*Damajuana*. Prov(in)cia de And(alucia) Castaña . . ." and *castaña* is explained as a great vessel of glass or terra-cotta, of the figure of a chestnut, and used to hold liquor."

One of the practical difficulties encountered by the writer on Eastern subjects is, how the peoples of India should be designated with strict accuracy and in a convenient form, so that there may be no want of clearness in the expression, or any apparent failing in necessary consideration and respect. The term *Indians*, which should be the simplest and most natural term, has become so closely identified with the tribes of North America, that it is not applicable to the people of Hindostan, and indeed, as it generally conveys an idea of ethnological inferiority, it would be half-resented by them under present circumstances. Nor is the term *natives* altogether satisfactory, although probably the best solution of the difficulty. Our ancestors in India had no such difficulty, for to them the inhabitants were simply *Moors*.

‘ Moor, Moorman.—A Mahommedan, and so, from the habitual use of the term (*Mouro*) by the Portuguese in India, particularly a Mahommedan inhabitant of India. In the Middle Ages, to Europe generally, the Mahommedans were known as *Saracens*. This is the word always used by Joinville and by Marco Polo. Ibn Batuta also mentions the fact in a curious passage (ii. 425-6). At a later day, when the fear of the Ottoman had made itself felt in Europe, the word *Turk* was that which identified itself with the Moslem, and thus we have in the Collect for Good Friday, “*Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics.*” But to the Spaniards and Portuguese, whose contact was with the Musulmans of Mauritania, who had passed over and conquered the Peninsula, all Mahommedans were *Moors*. So the Mahommedans, whom the Portuguese met with on their voyages to India on what coast soever, were alike styled *Mouros*, and from the Portuguese the use of this term, as synonymous with Mahommedan, passed to Hollanders and Englishmen. The word then, as used by the Portuguese discoverers, referred to religion and implied no nationality. It is plain indeed, from many passages, that the *Moors* of Calicut and Cochin were in the beginning of the sixteenth century people of mixt race, just as the *Moplas* are now. The Arab or Arabo-African occupants of Mozambique and Melinda, the Sumalis of Magodexo, the Arabs and Persians of Kalhat and Ormuz, the Boras of Guzerat, are all *Mouros* to the Portuguese writers, though the more intelligent among these are quite conscious of the impropriety of the term. The *Moors* of the Malabar coast were middlemen, who had adopted a profession of Islam for their own convenience, and in order to minister for their own profit to the constant traffic of merchants from Ormuz and the Arabian ports. Similar influences still affect the boatmen of the same coast, among whom it has become a sort of custom in certain families, that different members should profess respectively Mahommedanism, Hinduism, and Christianity. The use of the word *Moor* for Mahommedan died out pretty well among educated Europeans in the Bengal Presidency in the beginning of this century, or even earlier, but probably held its ground

ground a good deal longer among the British soldiery, whilst the adjective *Moorish* will be found in our quotations nearly as late as 1840. In Ceylon, the Straits and the Dutch Colonies, the term *Moorman* for a Mussulman is still in common use. Indeed the word is still employed by the servants of Madras officers in speaking of Mahomedans, or of a certain class of these.

The number of geographical descriptions in this volume is simply legion, as might be expected from the editor of 'Marco Polo' and 'Cathay and the Way Thither,' and it is very difficult to know exactly which place is best to select as a specimen of Colonel Yule's descriptive powers. We find that he becomes more elaborate in proportion to the subject of which he treats being less familiar, and we have therefore chosen the Seychelle Islands, the very least known of all the British possessions east of Suez and the Cape, which General Gordon thought realized better than any other spot the conditions of the Garden of Eden. We hesitated between choosing this, or the truly remarkable article on Java and its Upas tree, which exhausts and permanently settles the sensational and long-discussed stories first put forward by the Dutch surgeon Foersch. The Upas article must, however, be read in its entirety, and with all the accompanying quotations, to be appreciated.

Seychelle Islands.—A cluster of islands in the Indian Ocean, politically subordinate to the British Government of Mauritius, lying between 3° 40' and 4° 50' south latitude, and about 950 sea miles east of Mombas, on the East African coast. There are twenty-nine or thirty of the Seychelles proper, of which Mahé, the largest, is about 17 miles long by 3 or 4 wide. The principal islands are granitic and rise "in the centre of a vast plateau of coral" of some 120 miles diameter. These islands are said to have been visited by Soares in 1506, and were known vaguely to the Portuguese navigators of the sixteenth century as the Seven Brothers (*os sete Irmanos* or *Hermanos*), sometimes Seven Sisters (*Sete Irmanas*); whilst in Delisle's map of Asia (1700) we have both "les Sept Frères" and "les Sept Sœurs." Adjoining these on the west or south-west we find also on the old maps a group called the *Almirantes*, and this group has retained that name to the present day, constituting now an appendage of the Seychelles. The islands remained uninhabited, and apparently unvisited, till near the middle of last century. In 1742 the celebrated Mahé de la Bourdonnais, who was then Governor of Mauritius and the Isle of Bourbon, despatched two small vessels to explore the islands of this little Archipelago, an expedition which was renewed by Lazare Picault, the commander of one of the two vessels, in 1744, who gave to the principal island the name of *Mahé* and to the group the name of *Iles de Bourdonnais*, for which *Iles Mahé* (which is the name given in the "Neptune Orientale" of D'Après de Manneville, 1775) seems to have been substituted. Whatever may have been

La Bourdonnais' plans with respect to these islands, they were interrupted by his engagement in the Indian campaigns of 1745-6, and his government of Mauritius was never resumed. In 1756 the Sieur Morphey (Murphy?), commander of the frigate "*Le Cerf*," was sent by M. Magon, Governor of Mauritius and Bourbon, to take possession of the island of Mahé. But it seems doubtful if any actual settlement of the islands by the French occurred till after 1769.

Colonel Yule then proceeds to give a most interesting account of how these islands came by their modern name.

'A question naturally has suggested itself to us as to how the group came by the name of *Seychelles Islands*; and it is one to which no trustworthy answer will be found in English, if at all. Even French works of pretension (e.g. the "*Dictionnaire de La Rousse*") are found to state that the islands were named after "the Minister of Marine, Herault de Séchelles, who was eminent for his services and his able administration. He was the first to establish a French settlement there." This is quoted from La Rousse, but the fact is that the only man of the name known to fame is the Jacobin and friend of Danton, along with whom he perished by the guillotine. There never was a Minister of Marine so-called! The name Séchelles first (so far as we can learn) appears in the *Hydrographie Française* of Belin 1767, where, in a map entitled *Carte réduite du Canal de Mozambique*, the islands are given as *Les Iles Secheyles*, with two enlarged plans, *en cartouche*, of the *Port de Secheyles*. In 1767, also, the Chev. de Grenier commanding the *Heurr du Berger*, visited the Islands, and in his narrative states that he had with him the chart of Picault, "envoyé par La Bourdonnais pour reconnoître les isles des Sept Frères, lesquelles ont été depuis nommée iles Mahé et ensuite iles Sechelles." We have not been able to learn by whom the latter name was given, but it was probably by Morphey of the *Cerf*, for among Dalrymple's Charts (pub. 1771) there is a "*Plan of the Harbour adjacent to Bat River on the Island Seychelles, from a French plan made in 1756, published by Bellin.*" And there can be no doubt that the name was bestowed in honour of Moreau de Sechelles who was *Controleur-General des Finances* in France in 1754-6, i.e. at the very time when Governor Magon sent Captain Morphey to take possession. One of the islands again is called *Silhouette*, the name of an official who had been *Commissaire du roi près la Compagnie des Indes*, and succeeded Moreau de Sechelles as Controller of Finance; and another is called *Praslin*, apparently after the Duc de Choiseul Praslin who was Minister of Marine from 1766 to 1770. The exact date of the settlement of the islands we have not traced. We can only say that it must have been between 1769 and 1772. The quotation from the Abbé Rochon shows that the islands were not settled when he visited them in 1769, whilst that from Captain Neale shows that they were settled before his visit in 1772. It will be seen that both Rochon and Neale speak of Mahé as "the island Seychelles or Secheyles," as in Belin's chart of 1767. It seems probable

probable that the cloud under which La Bourdonnais fell on his return to France must have led to the suppression of his name in connection with the group. The islands surrendered to the English Commodore Newcome in 1794, and were formally ceded to England with Mauritius in 1815. *Seychelles* appears to be an erroneous English spelling, now, however, become established.'

Our next quotation is semi-geographical and semi-nautical, and we give it chiefly because it shows the origin of the Indian Navy, which many would wish to revive in the present day, not merely as a relief to the Royal Navy, but as better securing the representation of this country's naval power in Asiatic seas:—

'Bombay Marine.—This was the title borne for many years by the meritorious but somewhat depressed service which, in 1830, acquired the style of the "Indian Navy," and on the 30th of April, 1863, ceased to exist. The detachments of this force which took part in the China War (1841–42), were known to their brethren of the Royal Navy, under the temptation of alliteration, as the "Bombay Buccaneers." In their earliest employment against the pirates of Western India and the Persian Gulf, they had been known as "the Grab Service." But, no matter for these names, the history of this Navy is full of brilliant actions and services. We will quote two noble examples of public virtue. (1.) In July 1811, a squadron under Commodore John Hayes, took two large junks issuing from Batavia, then under blockade. These were lawful prizes, laden with Dutch property, valued at 600,000*l*. But Hayes knew that such a capture would create great difficulties and embarrassments in the English trade at Canton; and he directed the release of this splendid prize. (2.) 30th June, 1815, Lieut. Boyce, in the brig "Nautilus" (180 tons, carrying ten 18-pr. carronades and four 9-prs.), encountered the U. S. sloop-of-war "Peacock" (539 tons, carrying twenty 32-pr. carronades, and two long 18-prs.). After he had informed the American of the ratification of peace, Boyce was peremptorily ordered to haul down his colours, which he answered by a flat refusal. The "Peacock" opened fire, and a short but brisk action followed, in which Boyce and his first lieutenant were shot down. The gallant Boyce had a special pension from the Company (435*l*. in all), and lived to his 93rd year to enjoy it.'

The most superficial reader must be struck with the author's wide extent of reading, varied knowledge, and rare and happy knack of arranging his information. The copious extracts which we have made will show how wide is the field covered by 'Hobson Jobson,' and what a vast storehouse it is of pleasant and recondite erudition. There is, of course, much in the volume that any one could have discovered with some trouble and diligent enquiry; but there is also a great deal which, but for this Glossary, and but for Colonel Yule's habitual recognition,

nition, during his twenty years' researches into the dark places of Anglo-Indian and kindred literature, of Captain Cuttle's motto, 'when found make a note of,' would have been allowed to pass out of the memory of man. The magnitude of the obligation conferred by Colonel Yule's labours upon all students of Oriental lore, and lovers of literature, is not to be measured merely by the fact, that he has conveniently arranged and made accessible all the information bearing on the etymology and uses of Asiatic words and phrases. If he had done only this, he would still have accomplished a very creditable feat; but this is really only half his merit. He has discovered, as well as recorded what was already known, and he has brought a large amount of new matter to bear on old subjects, which are thus further exemplified and explained.

In some particulars this service is of inestimable value. We have shown, by many instances, how clear and convincing is Colonel Yule's method of illustrating his subjects; but our quotations have been taken exclusively from his own writing, and we have therefore not brought out, as clearly as may be desirable, the copious extracts from a succession of writers and chroniclers, by means of whose evidence he establishes the soundness of his arguments and the truth of his conclusions. In a certain sense these are the most characteristic part of the volume. It is just possible for us to imagine some other literary Anglo-Indian compiling a glossary with as many entries as are contained in 'Hobson Jobson,' but probably no one but Colonel Yule could have supplied the explanatory passages from all sorts and conditions of authors, written in many languages, and at widely different times. The erudition shown in the present work is indeed marvellous; and if Colonel Yule's position in the very first rank of Oriental savants were not already established, this latest production of his picturesque pen would place him there. Although solid, it is anything but dull or heavy reading. It affords pleasure equally, whether it is taken up for desultory examination, or for more careful reading, or for precise reference. For this last object it will be found complete and accurate: and Colonel Yule is to be congratulated on having given to the world of letters a book which is already an Anglo-Indian classic.

ART. VII.—1. *Report of the Royal Commission on Church Patronage*, 1879.

2. *Church Patronage Bill*, as amended by the Select Committee of the House of Lords, June 1886.

SOME persons of good intentions, who are persuaded that they have a mission to reform the Church of England, to stop the mouths of Dissenters, and to please the people, have been at work for a good while on the subject of private patronage. Such patronage they assure us that they value highly, and consider most beneficial to the Church, provided only it comes by inheritance and not by purchase; except when the purchases are made by landowners, and are approved by a Council, and that no patron shall sell less than his whole property. Their constant attempts to destroy the purchaseable character of patronage have already considerably lowered the price of it for the benefit of all purchasers; and for the benefit of those whom these good people pronounce to be the worst kind of purchasers, these efforts have lowered the price to a third or a quarter of what it used to be, for which some that we know are duly grateful. This is certainly a fair amount of success to have achieved by mere talking, and threatening, and bringing in Bills; and is an encouragement to go on and prosper.

Last year their Bill got through Committee, and would very likely have passed the third reading, but for that blast from Ireland and Hawarden which blew out the Parliament itself and brought it to an untimely though a very timely end. Since that time diocesan conferences and bodies of that kind have been generally approving it, but never very heartily, and never with any serious attempt to understand it or its certain consequences. It is time that somebody did make that attempt, and give the public the benefit of some criticism on it. We agree with what was said by one or two of the Lords, when the Bill was introduced in a long speech by the Archbishop, that the details of such a Bill cannot be properly discussed in the House of Lords; nor, we must add, in such conversation as takes place in a rather large committee almost entirely composed of men who are evidently far more certain to assent than to criticize.

The Bill is so loaded with details and qualifications and attempts to provide for everything, that it will therefore be hopeless to discuss it intelligibly without first attempting a summary of its chief provisions.

1. It repeals the Act of 9 Geo. IV. c. 94, which legalized resignation bonds, or bonds to resign a living in favour of any

one

one specified person, when required, or in favour of one or two specified relations of the patron, not more remote than great-nephew, and not including cousins, nor his wife's relations.*

2. It abolishes 'donatives,' to which a patron appoints without any presentation to the bishop, and consequently without the bishop having any power to exclude the nominee, however unfit he may be. Donatives are a complete anomaly, and are not numerous, or of any real value to a *bonâ fide* patron; and nobody in all the enquiries that have taken place has stood up for them. They are also proved to be sometimes (though the Commission says, not often) used improperly in mere trafficking in patronage, in ways that we need not explain.

3. The Bill provides for registration of the titles to patronage, which may now be kept secret, and for more publicity in all transactions for transferring it; and to these provisions also nobody seems to object, or reasonably can.

4. It removes the statutable disability of Papists to present to livings in their patronage. At present, if the patron has not prevented it by transferring the next presentation to some Protestant trustee, with a secret trust, or to any Protestant purchaser, the presentation goes to the two Universities. As all other kinds of Dissenters can present, and, if proper control over the presentation is reserved, in the way that we shall suggest—not the way of the Bill by any means—it does not seem that the most designing Popish patron could do any harm. At the same time, we do not disregard the apprehension, that such patrons uncontrolled might often do the worst they could for the Protestant parishioners, either as a matter of conscience, or, for what anybody can tell, under secret orders which they dare not disobey.

5. If a living remains under a sequestration for bankruptcy for a whole year, or if there are two sequestrations within two years, or if the incumbent creates any charge upon it for more than a year, it is to become void. It would be simpler to make sequestrations and charges void, as they are now on various kinds of salaries and pensions, and it would tend to keep clergymen from running into debt, because creditors would not trust them to any large amount.

6. If an incumbent remains lawfully confined for lunacy for two years he is to lose his living; except that the bishop may assign him a pension for as long as he pleases, up to a third of the value of the living, if he thinks it will bear it. If he recovers, as some lunatics happily do considerably after two years, the

* That Act did not recognize the equivalence of affinity to consanguinity, of which we hear so much on another subject.

Lunacy Commissioners are to inform the bishop, if he asks them. But if the two years are past the recovered lunatic cannot recover the living, nor is the bishop required to give him another. If we had not greater things to discuss we could easily enlarge on this new mode of punishing illness—and one illness alone. We leave it to the judgment of the public. At present such cases are dealt with by ‘curates in sole charge,’ who are in fact *loci tenentes* for as long as is necessary.

7. And now we come to the larger operations of the Bill. The first in simplicity is, that next presentations are no longer to be saleable at all, and that nothing less than ‘the patron’s whole interest,’ whatever it may be, is to be saleable; for he may own only the alternate or some still less frequent presentation.

8. Sales by auction of all patronage are to be abolished. There is no doubt that they cause scandal, and nobody seems to object to their abolition. At the same time, we are unable to be shocked at the case selected by the Primate to report to the House of Lords as peculiarly scandalous. It was that there had been a competition between some ritualistic and anti-ritualistic purchasers for a living at Liverpool. But inasmuch as each party is persuaded that its own is the best form of Christianity, and that they are doing the best thing they can by propagating it, one might have supposed an archbishop would consider that an innocent way of spending money, and the best rather than the worst motive for buying a living.

9. The sale of advowsons is subjected to a number of new and fanciful restrictions, which we must deal with in detail farther on.

10. And now comes such a revolution as was never dreamed of, even from the outside of the Church, since the Great Rebellion, when the Church was ruined for a time, and the clergy were turned out wholesale.* The bishop is not to institute or collate anybody until he has given a month’s notice to the parish; and any parishioner may object, that the nominee is over seventy, or under two years in priest’s orders, or too weak in body or mind, or in debt, or that ‘evil report exists about his morals,’ or (to fill up all holes) that ‘there are circumstances, not relating to doctrine or ritual, which make it unadvisable that he should be instituted to the benefice in question.’

11. That purely artificial offence called simony by Act of

* That little fact is always conveniently ignored by the modern Dissenting denouncers of the last Act of Uniformity, under which a very small proportion of the intruders of sixteen years before had to go out again, because they refused to conform and be ordained by bishops. The much larger proportion preferred conforming to resigning. We lately heard a preacher of ‘liberalism’ in a church pulpit speak as if he did not know that piece of Church history, or thought it immaterial.

Parliament is to be extended to a variety of things now lawful, and therefore not 'simoniacal;' and then, the odium of the name having thus done its business, the name is to be dropped hereafter.

12. There are some pages of elaborate constitution-mongering and provision for electing the new 'diocesan councils of patronage,' to which any objections by parishioners or the bishop himself *may* be referred, as they very soon *must be*. It would be a waste of time to criticize them, for two reasons; 1st, that we object to such presbyterianizing of the Church of England on any terms; and 2nd, that if once councils are put into the saddle they are sure to be made more and more 'popular' and 'representative,' and to acquire more and more power over the bishop and everybody by successive 'trusts of the people,' till the people are the masters of every bishop and patron and clergyman in England. Already there have been some very significant claims put forward by leading Dissenters in the most liberal and amiable language, 'not for confiscation of the revenues of the Church by any means,' or for throwing them away in compensations for life interest, or in any way giving them up, as in the Irish Church robbery; but for the much nicer result of sharing them, by 'widening' and 'liberalizing,' and making what is called 'the National Church' more national; so that Dr. Parker of the City Temple, Mr. Guinness Rogers, and every preacher of anything that he is pleased to call Christianity—or not—may have his share of the 7,000,000*l.* a year, and the 220 millions worth of Church property (according to their own absurdly-exaggerated figures),* which was all given to the Church for itself and not for them, either before or since any of their sects were invented. And all this on the pretext, that everybody has a right to go to church now: in which sense alone the Church belongs to everybody, including those who hate it so much that they show in every possible way that they would rather children had no religious education than that which is afforded by the Church.

If it is proposed to have any test of churchmanship for church elections, a test which is easy and universal in sects, or voluntary churches, even if they are episcopal, we are sure to

* See the correction of these fictitious estimates in Lord Selborne's excellent 'Defence of the Church against Disestablishment.' Both from his figures and those of the Patronage Commission it is clear that the *gross* income of the parochial clergy is—or rather was before it had declined so seriously—only about 4,500,000*l.*, and the episcopal and capitular incomes under 680,000*l.* The disestablishers further whet the appetites of their people, by adding some enormous sums for the value of our churches and cathedrals, on which we have spent nearly 40 millions in the present reign alone.

be met with the common claptrap against tests, and told that 'declarations' will not keep out liars, who say they are Churchmen but are not, and may belong to any 'Synagogue of Satan.' Even *bonâ fide* churchmen and women are often more unfit to judge of and vote for an incumbent than the worst patron under the control of the bishop, especially if that contest is made more real than it is at present.

If it be said that elections for diocesan conferences go on smoothly enough, we answer, that electing a few laymen to go and talk ecclesiology, which nobody attends to and which does nothing, is a very different thing from electing controllers of patronage. Indeed it is difficult to understand why people should need electing at all for those little imitations of the great debating society called the Church Congress, and not need electing for the Congress itself. But, notoriously, nothing is so efficient a summons to any council as a bit of real patronage to be dealt with.

It will very soon be understood that these diocesan councils, by interfering with, and having practically a veto on, all the patronage of the diocese, are on the road to dispensing with patronage altogether. The bishops and the Crown will not long be able to withdraw their patronage from the control of these councils; and already the Bill practically endows parochial councils with unlimited power to object. Yet many of the clergy are suicidal enough to invite parochial councils into the saddle, with no chance of their ever being thrown off again. A bishop who is fond of publishing his views elsewhere than in charges, has been several times quoted as saying, that the theological opinions of nine out of ten of the laity are, at present, exactly opposite to those of nine out of ten of the clergy. Even if that is an exaggeration in figures, it is probably true in substance; and as one majority is as good as another, the clergy had better recognize this fact before it is too late. The whole situation will be changed when councils come into real power, instead of being a mere debating society, or 'chatterbox,' as a distinguished ecclesiastic used to call them before he became an *ex officio* member of Convocation; in which, however, he is not silent, nor do we mean that he ought to be.

We have already noticed comprehensively the various objections, lettered *a, b, c, d, e, f, g*, which may be made by either parochial or diocesan objectors to a nomination, as may be seen from ss. 15 and 16 of the Bill. Altogether they plainly amount to a trial by a diocesan jury of the unfortunate presentee on any or all of such charges or objections as may be made by any voluntary parochial council, or by any one parishioner who is rich

rich enough to fight for them, and is determined to keep out the presentee if he can, or to ruin him if he is poor. Yet neither bishops nor patrons in the House of Lords, or elsewhere, nor Conference and Congress orators, nor the clergy, whom it concerns most of all, appear to have ever opened their eyes to this impending revolution.

Doubtless we shall be told, that we are under a complete 'misapprehension' about the effect of the Bill; that it has no intention of impairing the rights of patrons at all; and that we probably have not observed that though those objections of seven letters of the alphabet, including one objection that comprehends every other that is possible, may be made, yet the bishop is not bound even to refer them to the council, nor to act upon their verdict if he does. For a speech, where there is no opposition, this may do very well; but it will not do, where there is time and opportunity to reply deliberately to such an answer. The bishops could not long go on refusing to refer objections from a large elected parochial council, or to act upon the verdict of the more distinctly authorized diocesan council. After a very few refusals there would be an outcry against their power to refuse either; and unless things get wonderfully changed we should soon see the Primates of the day, with their suffragans behind them, either promising publicly to listen to their parishes, and to consult and obey their councils, or, more likely still, bringing in some self-denying Bill to compel the bishops to give way, and to 'trust the people.'

And now suppose the diocesan Inquisition set to work to torture a poor presentee, after the manner of the older Inquisition, in order to ascertain whether he deserves to live; and it will be seen presently that those words are the result of actual experience in another Church. Perhaps he is accused of being (d) 'not strong enough for the place.' Very likely he has been overworked in a curacy, or in an often poorer vicarage, and does look weak; and some benevolent patron, possibly the bishop himself, meant to relieve him by an easier place. If he cannot bring half a dozen doctors to swear against the half dozen who will be brought by his objectors, and perhaps he has not half a dozen guineas in the world to bring them with, he may as well give up. Or some parochial Plutus accuses him of being in debt (e). Very likely he is, more or less; or at any rate his affairs are such as he would be unwilling to disclose to a set of clerical and lay representatives of the whole diocese. He and his patron hoped that this new presentation would relieve his poverty, as well as improve his health. But the Inquisition may refuse to recognize this benevolent intention, and they will certainly

certainly object, if the majority dislike him for any private reason, bad or good; though they will take care not to give a statutablely bad reason. Or an 'evil report exists about his moral conduct' (*f*). That will be a pleasant issue to fight. The Bill does not even require it to be found true; it has only to *exist*, and he may be legally done for and ruined for ever. Unless he is rich enough to fight an action of libel to prove that the charge was not made 'in good faith,' as the Bill says, he has no possible remedy; and he will always be told that he ought to have tried the action. There have been cases in the newspapers where bishops have told clergymen so, as the only way of answering an 'evil report.'

And then comes the sweeping-up besom (*g*) of general 'unadvisability in the interests of the parish, that he should be instituted to the benefice in question'—a piece of English fit for such an Act of Parliament, if that straw is worth adding to its back. What poor man, or even rich man, who is not persuaded that he will be divinely helped to fight with beasts at Ephesus, would fight such an issue against a set of parishioners prepared to swear, that in their opinions he is undesirable? They may desire somebody else, some pet curate who is there already, or some semi-dissenting preacher from a neighbouring or distant chapel. Therefore anybody else is 'undesirable,' and his institution will be very unpopular, and will make a disturbance in the parish, and empty the church, and do anything else that they like to say; and the diocesan council will be dared to tell the bishop, and the bishop dared to believe, that the presentee ought to be forced on an unwilling congregation. All this, and its inevitable consequences, are so obvious to common sense that it is one of the worst signs of the time that a bench of bishops, and such peers as attend to these matters generally (or were able to do so last year), and all the patrons of England, and the orators of Congresses and Conferences, and the clergy and intending clergy or their parents, have had their eyes so blinded by the passion for appearing as reformers of everything, as to promote and accept such a revolution. They deserve not to have their eyes opened until they find themselves under the harrow for ever; as they assuredly will find themselves, if they do not take warning while there is yet time. If they think the government of the Church too aristocratic, they will find in ten years that they have exchanged it for a *kakistocracy*.

While writing this, we casually fell upon a most significant confirmation of our prophecy in one of the Church newspapers, given in the form of some resolutions of a body calling itself the

the *National Church Reform Union*, with County Court 'Judge Hughes in the chair, approving the general provisions of the Archbishop's Bill,' with the qualification that 'the constitution of the Diocesan Council is very unsatisfactory,' and that 'the electors of the Church Boards ought to be the same as the electors of churchwardens in an ancient parish': who—Judge Hughes at any rate must know—are all the ratepayers of all degrees of Dissent, down to atheists. The law was settled in the days when there were no Dissenters, and churchwardens had not only ecclesiastical functions. So we have not to wait long for the demand for a 'more popular constitution' of the Council, which the bishops think is to assist them, though it will very soon ride over them, and sit on every presentation, and claim it, and get it. Indeed they have all but surrendered to the Association already; for they only interpose an 'electoral college' (which will be as effective as it is in America) between the new diocesan Government and the voters for churchwardens.

There has been a still more important confirmation, not merely of demands, but of aggression which has at last swallowed up everything, in a Church not far off. The circumstances of that transaction are only twelve years old: but it is the fashion now to ignore all experience, and only to trust theory and your own expectations—and 'the people.' The House of Lords forgot the whole story with respect to Scotch Church patronage, which, in 1874, was elaborately told them concurrently by distinguished persons on both sides of the House. We have thought it prudent to read those debates again, in order to be able to tell the story here as briefly, but as fully, as is requisite for our present purpose. The Established Scotch Church being Presbyterian, the bodies which we may shortly call Church Councils necessarily had the functions of bishops in approving presentees to livings. After all the confusion of the Reformation and the subsequent attempts to restore episcopacy, and an Act of 10 Anne c. 2 for 'restoring the rights of patrons,' subject to approval as above, we come to 1835. Till then the Councils had no power of absolute rejection without reasons, any more than our bishops have; but their reasons were subject to appeal to the 'Superior Judicature of the Church,' as bishops' reasons are with us, and in some cases (of *quare impedit*) to the Courts of Common Law, as in the case of Bishop Fraser's refusal of Mr. Gill, which the Court upheld. But in 1835 the General Assembly of the Scotch Church took upon itself to make a decree, that the majority of the male heads of families in a parish, members of the congregation and 'in full communion' (which by the Act

of

of Anne meant communicants), might reject a presentee without giving any reason. The decree of the Assembly was declared *ultra vires* and illegal in the famous Auchterarder case, both by the Court of Session and the House of Lords. Consequently an Act (called Lord Aberdeen's) was passed in 1843, 6 & 7 Vict. c. 61, giving to parishioners more power of objecting, and requiring a presentee to preach before them. But still the objections were to be specific, and not mere general disapproval; and appeals on both sides were still allowed. That decision and the Act led to the secession of about a third of the existing ministers, and a great many laymen, and the formation of what they called 'the Free Church,' which differed from the Established Church in nothing save this revolt against patronage; and, since the Act of 1874, differs in nothing at all. But for some mysterious reason the Free Church, after the usual fashion of seceders, however invisible their differences may be, has refused to reunite with the Establishment.

But now comes a fact, which is more significant than any number of speeches and pamphlets as to the effect of these gradual encroachments on the old rights of patrons. In thirty years after the Act of 1843 all the principal patrons in Scotland had come to the conclusion, that patronage was practically annihilated; and the Duke of Richmond brought in a Government Bill which the Duke of Argyll supported, and nobody opposed so far as to call for a division. So the Act passed, for abolishing patronage in Scotland altogether, and leaving election to parochial boards, but also giving what was called full compensation to the patrons. And this adds another historical argument against this Bill. For though the compensation was fixed by the Act at only one year's value of the living, while our advowsons used to be worth ten, the Duke of Argyll, who said he was the largest patron in Scotland, declared that it was too much; and one or two other Lords intimated that they could not honourably take it, for this striking reason, that the previous successive Acts had destroyed all the selling value of patronage, and destroyed it so completely that no bidding at all could be got for some Edinburgh livings, which by Act of Parliament had, like the English Corporation patronage, to be sold; and the Act therefore had to be so far repealed. The Duke of Richmond said it had been found impossible to subject presentees to the 'torture' of such an Inquisition as had gradually been established, which might easily ruin them in costs if they survived the torture. A man who was once pronounced unfit was of course professionally killed for ever. And so practically all the patrons agreed, that having lost their property by these successive

successive legislative aggressions and concessions, patronage had become only a burden to them and a curse to presentees; and that they had better give it up, and let the parochial boards elect their ministers direct, instead of by the eliminating process of objecting to and ruining any one they did not want.

It was not surprising that the Duke of Argyll added, that the clergy of his Church do not occupy the same social position as the English. We have plenty of other proof just now, that the lower the sphere of the electors to any office, the lower is the position of the elected. If the Primate and the Bishop of Peterborough and their followers, who go on charging and clamouring for patronage Bills, want to frighten away from Holy Orders the very kind of men they always say that they are anxious to bring in, and whom private patronage, including purchase, does bring in, no such plan as this Bill has ever been invented for keeping them out, by anybody worth notice. The bishops constantly profess to value private patronage, to which belong nearly half the livings in number, and more than half in value, most highly, for various good reasons; and they never deny that it is generally now administered very carefully and well, though of course there are exceptions;—and with what kind of patrons would there not be exceptions? Thereupon they do their best to follow the Scotch example of destroying private patronage, and of gradually introducing what is notoriously the very worst kind of patronage that exists, fortunately yet to a small extent only, viz. popular election which bears no analogy to ‘self-elected,’ i.e. coöpted trustees. Not everybody knows that, thirty years ago, an Act was passed to induce electing parishioners to give up their power for certain advantages to the livings, as the elections had caused some of the worst clerical scandals. But the Act has been quite inoperative. The electors prefer the scandals—as Lord Derby did the gout to the new wine.

Perhaps we shall be told, that one bishop has already handed over his own patronage to a council. So we had better reply:—(1) That he has no right to devolve his own responsibility on other people. That is a legal rule for all discretionary official duties, unless devolution is expressly authorized; and it is equally a moral one. (2) That there are already two opinions about the success of the experiment. (3) That a voluntary devolution, which can be revoked in a moment, is entirely different from the scheme of this Bill. (4) That this is not the first experiment of the same bishop in overriding the law. One had to be revoked, through the opposition of the Lower House of Convocation, though the Bishop had got a majority in the Upper, by the Primate’s casting vote, in favour of turning

ing lay preachers into our churches. So we are not overwhelmed by that precedent.

It will be answered to all this, that it is universally agreed that the bishops have practically no power to reject unfit presentees, for even to enquire properly into their fitness. The examination for insufficient learning is generally impracticable, and would not meet the real difficulty. Examinations for heresy are still more dangerous, as Bishop Phillpotts found to his cost. Bishop Fraser indeed did succeed in a case where a man had been presented, with the obvious intention of continuing the same illegal practices for which his predecessor had been deprived, and which he himself as avowed that he meant to continue. And the bishop was publicly abused by the two deans who distinguish themselves occasionally in that way, for defending the suit, in which he was pronounced right, and the plaintiff wrong. As to any enquiry about morals, or general fitness, which is quite undefinable by rules, the bishops have no power at all, if the man has not been convicted, however notorious his unfitness may be.

But then comes a difficulty which it is useless to ignore. Among the multitude of English bishops, now thirty-three and possibly thirty-five, there always have been and always will be a few who are so much distrusted by one party or other in the Church as thorough-going partisans, or by all parties as men of no discretion, that any general proposal to give the bishops by Act of Parliament unlimited discretion of another kind would raise violent opposition. Some appear to have been doing their best to persecute (not prosecute) clergymen who have been performing strictly English Service in Scotch churches or buildings not belonging to the recognized Scotch Episcopal Church, which has a different Communion Consecration-prayer from ours. Whether that is wise or not, it is unquestionably lawful, and any attempt to 'visit for it' here is utterly unjustifiable persecution. Some bishops have raised a worse difficulty still, in the way of giving them any more discretionary power, by their use of the dispensing power which was given them in the two modern Acts about clerical offences. In our article on 'the Ritualists and the Law,' of Jan. 1881, we quoted the censure of an eminent Judge of the Appeal Court on the refusal of a bishop to allow a prosecution for some glaring violations of the law as already declared. Three years later, the exercise of that dispensing power, commonly called the Veto, had got so much worse, that it was condemned altogether by a large and weighty minority of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, comprising the Archbishop of York, the Dean of

Archbishop, the Lord Chief Justice, the Vicar-General of Canterbury, the Chancellors of (now) nine other dioceses, the late Chairman of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and a Dean. Since then there have been several more such cases—two within the last month—of refusal by bishops, and an archbishop as the legal deputy of a bishop, to allow illegal practices to be stopped in the only way they can be stopped, except by indictment of the clergy at the Assizes under the Act of Uniformity. People are finding out at last that the Veto, which was intended only to enable the bishops to stop frivolous and vexatious prosecutions (which power ought to have been given to the Judge, who cannot stop them at all), enables any bishop, with the concurrence of any clergymen who choose to follow or to lead him, to alter the law of England as to the whole of the Church services, to permit them to re-introduce the Mass, or omit all the Creeds and preach Unitarianism, or publish any kind of 'depravation' of the Bible and Prayer-book, to repeal the Act of Uniformity, and to set aside all the rubrics, and every judgment of the Privy Council and the Court of Arches that they please. They have indeed to give reasons in writing; but it is easy to invent excuses to be 'registered' as 'reasons,' which are as easy to see through as they are to invent.

The bishops themselves appear to have been conscious of the difficulty of asking for more power to do the work which they were meant to do from time immemorial. There never was a time when patrons could found benefices (except the few small 'donatives,' which probably began as private chapels) on any other terms than that the parson should be *idoneus* in the fair judgment of the bishop, who was restrainable by law if he exceeded that fair limit. It does not follow that, because the power of the bishops has gradually been reduced by lawsuits, and by the fear of law, the proper remedy is to presbyterianize and democratize the Church of England, as this Bill proposes. We know that it is dangerous to suggest rival schemes, however bad may be the one you are criticizing; for as a matter of course, faults can be found in the alternative proposed, and then it will be said that all the criticism has failed; although perhaps not a word of it can be refuted, and the criticized scheme is absolutely bad, worse indeed than leaving things alone.

Nevertheless we will run that risk; and, in order to clear the ground, we must point out, that another of the mistakes of the Bill is the very common one of endeavouring to supply discretion by sub-sections of an Act. No doubt it was natural to endeavour to moderate the tyranny of a majority of a board or council by limitations and directions, and to forget the fate

of such attempts in Scotland. But the degree of wisdom and foresight with which these limitations were made, independently of the certain failure of any such rules, may be seen from this specimen:—The occasional filling up of a vacancy in a private living by a superannuated man being an evil, they resolve that a presentee may be objected to, and rejected, if he is over seventy. But suppose a patron wants to move him from a large and hard parish to a small and easy one. Is that a bad thing for the Church? Yet somebody in the small and easy parish would most likely object and demand a trial before the council, which the presentee would probably recoil from, and so the old man will be kept grinding on in the hard place, whereas he would do much better in the easier one. Do bishops or judges generally resign at seventy? Or is it at all desirable that as a rule they should? Yet vicars can do a great deal more by deputies and assistants, male and female, than either bishops or judges. We need not, however, fritter away criticism on the larger defects by such details as this. It is enough to show how little they have been really attended to, with all the parade of minuteness on the face of the Bill.

But having said all that we suppose can be said against trusting bishops with discretionary power, we have to remember that this, like everything else, is a question of alternatives. We will say no more about councils and parochial boards: for, if we have not said enough to warn the clergy of the snare prepared for them, our endeavour is hopeless. Now comes the alternative question, How can discretion be best saved from indiscretion? Unquestionably not by general rules. A rule means the very contrary of discretion; and the idea of trying by rules all kinds of fitness, for such an office as that of the parson of a parish, is greater folly than ever entered the head of a Civil Service examiner, who thinks he can do everything by 'marks.' What the clergy and people have to fear is the prejudices of any single bishop unrestrained by any discretion but 'the length of his own foot.' The obvious cure for that is to make the bishop feel, that he has to measure by other people's feet too. And this would happen the moment he remembered that he is subject to a real appeal to judges of his own order, appointed '*ad hoc*' and not permanently, in any proper way, on whose prejudices he cannot count beforehand. If the appeal were only to an archbishop, that might be no security at all, to either a parish, a patron, or a clergyman.

Some of us are old enough to remember how the unlimited discretion of bishops as to ordination was, in respect of one of the most learned bishops of his time, Herbert Marsh of

Peterborough, once controlled merely by some speeches in the House of Lords on his alleged rejection of candidates for theological views which he thought erroneous—much as in the case of Bishop Phillpotts and Mr. Gorham. The bishops have a full right to object to being exposed to lawsuits for exercising a *bonâ fide* judgment for the good of the Church and the parish, and with studious justice to presentees; who cannot all be angels or apostles; England does not grow 15,000 of the article at once.* An appeal to some two or three other bishops need not be a lawsuit. The bishop appealed from need not take any part in it unless he chooses, any more than a judge of the High Court intervenes, except sometimes in prohibitions, which the Government helps him to oppose in cases of importance. The case would simply be re-heard by the bishops appealed to, and should certainly be heard in private; which would be impossible with a council or board of any kind. If the rejected presentee demanded the bishop's reasons, he should give them; but such an appeal would probably be made very seldom; as it very seldom is now against the bishop's removal of a curate, who can appeal to the archbishop, if his incumbent is non-resident.

In fact the errors made by bishops with an appeal over them to others, would be, as of course they ought to be, much oftener on the side of theological tolerance than of theological intolerance. Nor is there any reason to fear, that errors would be frequent either way, and certainly not on the side of strictness as to general unfitness. If the bishops should be thought too easy, we reply, that they will certainly be less so than the fear of lawsuits makes them now. And even if they are too easy, that is no reason for taking any more leaps in the dark; there is no political end to leap for, this time. Here, as in the most momentous questions both of faith and action, there must be a balance of probabilities, of which one may be safe and the other perilous. The risk involved in any such scheme as that of this Bill preponderates infinitely over the risk involved in the other, for the Bill would be irrevocable, while the conduct of the bishops may be changed. If bishops with no control but the appeal to two or three others are gradually found too easy in admitting presentees, they will gradually find it necessary to become stricter; and the public will back them, because the public will *ex hypothesi* have been saying that they ought to be stricter.

* Lord Selborne ascertained from the archdeacons, that there were (just then) 14,558 parish churches in England, exclusive of the Isles of Man and the Channel, and the cathedrals with all their canons. There were 5795 curates. Of course they are all increasing yearly.

The questions still remain, On what information (if any) from outside are bishops to proceed in examining the fitness of presentees? Are the presentees, or the patron, to give notice of a nomination to the parish? Or is that to be left to the discretion of the bishop? It is not necessary to decide such questions now; but our scheme would make a great change from the present system, by giving bishops full discretion to refuse, subject to appeal, and by enabling them to give any notices, and to make any enquiries, and to demand any certificates they please, besides those at present permitted and required, and also the customary additional certificate of the bishop of the three certifying clergymen that they are worthy of credit, which last has been decided not to be legally requirable now, and does not seem worth the fuss that is made about it. In most cases the bishop knows perfectly well that a presentee is absolutely 'idoneus,' and ought not to be subjected to the insult of any special enquiry. If he does not know this, he will have unlimited power of enquiry, and of giving notice in the parish if he pleases, with proper provisions against lapse, for which the time for presentation should be shortened. And there must be 'absolute privilege' for informants; or every presentee who is accused of drunkenness will bring an action and always get from a British jury a verdict for 'malice,' to override the 'privilege,' with 'applause in Court immediately suppressed by the ushers.' The sympathy of the people with a drunken parson is pleasantly manifested at the holding of a commission on a clergyman under the Clergy Discipline Act; which, by one of the usual triumphs of ecclesiastical legislation, requires the commission to be held in public, though it is only a kind of small grand jury, to say whether the case is to go farther, and need not be held at all, if the bishop likes to act without it.

This is enough to say about that part of the Bill; and we now turn to its provisions for the sale of livings, of which it appears from the two reports, that about 6230 are legally saleable, against 6930 which are not; and that about 2500 only are in episcopal patronage and 944 in the patronage of various officers called 'the Crown,' including a few pertaining to the Prince of Wales. These figures are all slightly approximate, because of a few livings of mixed patronage. We have already said that the value of the saleable livings nevertheless rather exceeds that of the unsaleable. The fall that has taken place in the selling value of next presentations since the bishops began bringing in these Bills, with diocesan conferences applauding them, is far greater than the fall in annual value
from

from all other causes. We frequently see in the newspapers abortive attempts to get any bid worth attending to at sales by auction; and latterly these auctions seem to have been given up. The evidence in the Commission only reaches up to nine years ago, and is therefore useless for one end of the story; but it is useful for the other, in telling us that the general price for presentations to good livings (which sell better than bad ones which leave very little net income), with a prospect of speedy possession, used to be about five years' income; and such cases as we happen to remember agree therewith. The other day we learnt that a good living and house in a country parish, to which there seemed to be no objections, with an old incumbent in bad health, who wanted to resign, was sold for a little over a year and a half's purchase. We have no definite information about the present selling price of advowsons, but there is no doubt they also have gone down; not so much, however, as the presentations, because the episcopal crusade has not been avowedly against them, and the nature and effect of this Bill are evidently not yet understood.

Very likely most alarmists were quieted on this point by the Primate's assurance, when he introduced the Bill last May, that it was 'a misapprehension to suppose that it will injure private patronage'; which he and his brethren, and every witness worth notice in the previous Commission and Committee, expressed their anxiety not to do, on account of the value of private patrons to the Church in various ways. Of these the most obvious are, that private patronage brings, into what is popularly, though wrongly, called 'the Church,' many excellent men who would never go into it for the precarious chances of any public patronage; and that the power of buying livings brings in many men who would neither ask public nor private patrons for them, and would not go into Orders on the chance of remaining curates or even vicars, in places that they think odious, until they are old men or die. Another reason, which was probably in the minds of some witnesses who talked vaguely of the responsibilities of patrons, was, or at any rate ought to have been, that the private patron of a living is generally the first person attacked by the clergy and the parishioners when they want anything in the remotest degree connected with the church. Of course patrons do not always take the same view as the applicants of their duty to contribute something out of nothing that produces any benefit to them; and a good many of the old patrons are now too poor to acknowledge any such artificial claims: which is a further reason for encouraging rather than impeding new and richer patrons to come in. But, on the other hand, a great many do admit the claim to the

extent

extent of acceding to it. If they are gradually being made to perceive, that they are only to be kept alive for the purpose of being bled whenever a little 'new blood' is wanted (which people are so fond of now), and to be told on every possible occasion, the utterly illegal dictum, that their rights are 'a sacred trust' for somebody else, one would think that most people of common sense could foresee the consequences.

Of all the dialectic tricks of modern appropriators (not in the tithing sense) none requires more careful watching than that of getting one first to acquiesce in the application of a metaphorical phrase to some common thing, and then arguing from it as if its widest meaning had been accepted. In a certain loose sense a man who has founded a church, now or 800 years ago, may be said to have, as lawyers say, 'clothed himself with a trust' to present to the bishop as its parson a clerk in priest's orders who is fit for it, 'idoneus,' as the old and not obsolete word is, and by no means necessarily 'optimus.' Even that is wrong, except as a metaphorical phrase on which nothing can be logically founded. Any law book will tell those who do not know, that a condition is not a trust; and still less is the reservation of a right; and that a trust is something definite which a man is bound to do. A patron is not bound to do anything. By the old law, which has never been altered yet, he reserved the right (*i.e.* the law silently reserved it for him) to appoint within six months an incumbent whom the bishop did not pronounce *non idoneus*, *doctrinâ* (in both senses) *aut moribus*. For securing fitness there have been two opportunities already, and with unlimited discretion, *viz.* at the man's two ordinations; and at his presentation there is another, but not with unlimited discretion; and we have already said that, in one way or another, and especially of late, the discretion is limited too much. And because it is, so the bishops turn round upon the patrons and say that the sacred trust is upon *them*. So far is that from being the law, that if an ecclesiastical patron presents a man who is found wanting by the bishop he is held to have lost the presentation; and Bishop Phillpotts acted on this rule, but if a lay patron makes that mistake he does not lose the presentation. If this illegal nonsense about 'trusts,' which has merely been invented for a purpose, is allowed to pass uncorrected any longer, the next generation of appropriators of other people's rights and property, and very likely some of the present, will go another step, and solemnly assert, as an unquestionable maxim, that every man who has founded a church has clothed himself with a sacred trust always to present the best man that can be found, either by the bishop,

or

or by the diocesan council, or by the parochial council elected by 'the voters for churchwardens,' according to Mr. T. Hughes and the 'National Church Reformers.' One maxim is as good as another when you are inventing. Paley said nothing is easier.

In discussing this question of the sale of livings we are saved some trouble by the continual confession, which seems to be denied by nobody, that not only the inheritors of *advowsons*, but their purchasers, generally behave very well, and do their best to put in good incumbents; and there is no doubt that the men for whom livings are bought have oftener some private means, and so are able to do more for a parish, than those who go into orders for a living. The bishops have never dared to say that they are now generally inferior to others; and nobody with much experience would believe them if they did say so. And yet the Bill begins with a set of ridiculous and priggish limitations, not on the sale of presentations only, but on the sale of *advowsons*. In this age of the world we have got too old to believe in such an antiquated way as experience of learning how a thing works. It is much better to guess at people's probable motives, or at such of them as occur to us; and then to assume it as an axiom, that they will always act according to our guess at probability. If the facts are obstinately otherwise, 'so much the worse for them.' Several witnesses before the Commission said, truly enough, that patrons who have a large interest in a parish generally take all the care they can to put in good incumbents. Therefore the next step in the logic of these meddlers is, that no patron who buys the living without having land in the parish worth 200*l.* a year will care whom he puts in, except he be a relation or a friend for whom he bought it; and the next is, that the relation or friend of a purchaser, though not of an inheritor of an *advowson*, is so likely to be a bad incumbent that he ought to be made impossible without express consent of the council, who are to represent the Churchmen, the Dissenters, and the atheists, of the diocese.

When the bishops and clergy send out begging letters for building, restoring, or endowing churches, do they never expect or get considerable sums from persons who have not an acre or a house worth 10*l.* a year in the parish? They can rake up fast enough the most recondite and forgotten connection between possible subscribers and the parish, when they want anything. Perhaps you recognize the claims, and help to endow or restore or build the church so largely as to secure the thing being done by smaller subscriptions; and the church-building Acts allow you to have the patronage in some such cases.

Suppose,

Suppose, however, that a few years afterwards the living is for sale, and it occurs to you that you would like to have it on account of old connections. Then the clergy will turn round upon you with this Act and say, 'No; you have not 200*l.* a-year in this parish. You cannot buy the living without leave, not even from the bishop, but from the council of presentations.' Do these people, who assure us that it is quite a misapprehension to suppose that they would do anything to injure private patronage, believe that private patrons, or those who are willing to throw away some money to become so, will stand that kind of meddling, and go before a sort of diocesan vestry to explain all their reasons for wanting a particular living: whom they want it for, if for anybody definite; and then to answer a set of impertinent questions about him: or, if you have no definite presentee in your mind, any number of equally impertinent questions about your own 'views;' and in short anything that an utterly irresponsible body, or any mischievous fool in it, chooses to ask?

We do not want to put the case so much on the pecuniary injury to patrons, which obviously varies directly as the amount of new restrictions and interference, as on the injury to the Church thereby, which, luckily for our trouble, is undisputed. The more the authors of the Bill declare that they do not want to injure private patronage, the more fatal to their case and the Bill is every proof that it must injure it. The mere threat of it has done so already; and these new restrictions will injure it much more. The very form of the initial sale clause is misleading. It pretends to be an enabling clause, not a disabling one. What unlearned person would guess from reading that 'subject to this Act, any person may sell his estate, interest, or right, to such and such persons,' that it really means, 'whereas hitherto everybody may sell as he pleases, hereafter he shall sell to nobody except the very limited classes herein specified; and any stranger who wants to buy shall explain his reasons to an elected purchase and presentation board, which may reject them?' That would have opened the eyes of those who read running, instead of lulling them to sleep by assurances that they have nothing to fear from such good friends and admirers of private patrons.

And what is the excuse for all this meddling with the sale of advowsons, which necessarily followed from their existence, and has been the law and the practice from time immemorial? There has been a feeble attempt to make out, that sales only came as an accidental result of 'advowsons in gross,' or severed from the manors to which they were originally 'appendent.' But inasmuch as the owners always could sever them, that theory

theory is a mere *ex post facto* invention. Moreover, why should a severed advowson be any worse administered than an attached one? Did patrons in the position, actually or virtually, of lords of manors never send their younger sons into Orders in order that they might be provided for by holding the family living? and this oftener formerly than now? And were or are such men a bit better, on the average, than the son or son-in-law or nephew of a rich stranger, who very seldom buys a living for his young relation until he knows that he is, or means to be, ordained? We trow not. Yet the Bill does not stop such family arrangements by territorial church patrons, and no Bill can which leaves patrons any real rights of patronage at all. But the suggestion we have made would include these presentations too; and in fact, if properly administered, it covers everything that is needed.

Another excuse was given by the Primate in his speech; that it is unfair that livings should be sold after being augmented by the Ecclesiastical Commission. But the Commissioners are rightly shy of augmenting private livings except on such terms as they please. In a case which we suppose is not unique, they stipulated for the patronage of a very poor living going to the bishop after the life of the owner; or they could stipulate for an alternate presentation, if it were worth doing, for the increased value of the living is of course a certain benefit to the patron. After all the Bill does not prevent an augmented living from being sold, nor could it do so without exceptional injustice. We do not therefore see why the Primate made this strange assertion, except as part of the general crusade against private patronage; which is manifestly at the bottom of the whole scheme of the Bill, however much it may be disavowed as a 'misapprehension.' There clearly is one somewhere. He also said, 'It is repulsive that a man who has a great public and spiritual trust should allow it to be exercised for a sum of money'; ('Hansard' omits the following) or for political services, or for private friendship or relationship; or should hand over this 'great spiritual trust' to a body of expanded churchwardens.

A more solid reason for watching sales of advowsons closely, if sales of presentations are to be stopped, would be to prevent frauds; but, even on that hypothesis, a promiscuous council is as bad a body to investigate frauds as could be invented. And still less could it be done by the help of half an alphabet of sub-sections of objections to be taken, and some more general rules, which this Bill, like the Public Worship Act, says are to be made hereafter. There has been a general suspicion
raised,

raised, and carefully kept up by well ventilating a few bad cases, that nearly all these sales of advowsons are tainted with fraud, and with that convenient bugbear called simony, which means whatever the speaker thinks ought to be made simony by law. And therein we must confess to a little disappointment. We knew that the chief of the agents who manage these sales was a gentleman whom we need not shrink from naming, Mr. Emery Stark; and when we saw his name in the margin of several pages of the evidence, and especially that his chief examiner was the Bishop of Peterborough, the initiator of these Bills thirteen years ago, we hope it is not below the dignity of the occasion to say, that we expected the fun of seeing Mr. Stark stripped as naked as his surname, and 'polished off' as clean as with his other name. We grieve to find that the result was different. Nothing could be more open and straightforward than his answers; and his ideas of the distinction between the law as it is, and what some people think it ought to be, were a great deal clearer than theirs. Moreover, the very clever orator who cross-examined him has yet to learn, from some 'old legal hand' perhaps, that mere verbal victories in cross-examination, in order to make out that something should be called this or that, when everybody knows what it really is, do not go for much with any intelligent jury, or prove anything beyond the cleverness of the examiner. Counsel are sometimes misled by vanity and temper to waste time in that way; but those who think more of their clients than themselves, know better. And we are sadly constrained to say, that on matters of fact the victory remained with Mr. Stark, though the bishop got the best of it about some epithets, not worth a farthing. Mr. Stark's evidence was entirely unshaken, as to the general good character and motives of the purchasers of next presentations.

Still, there were some bad cases of this kind of traffic proved against certain absent agents, who appeared to deserve their reputation, and some of them had come to grief. But we need not go and bore another great hole in the bottom of the Church of England (as Carlyle said a late celebrated dignitary was always doing) in order to wash out a few dirty transactions, which could be prevented if the bishops had power to enquire, and would use it as they ought. It is utterly unproved and untrue, that private sales of next presentations, even now, generally or often, bring in worse incumbents than do those whom we may call the lords of manors, or the most *bonâ fide* purchasers of advowsons, or the three fluctuating people called 'the Crown,' or the bishops themselves, who sometimes make as great mistakes as anybody. And it would be still more untrue, if all transactions had to be registered

registered and examined by the proper episcopal officers. It would be nearer the truth to say, that the sale of presentations brings in better men in various ways for the parish, than it would have got if the presentation could not have been sold.

We were amused at the miserably illogical attempts of the advocates of prohibition to make out any substantial difference between one future presentation and all future presentations. They delivered a variety of ingenious oratorical and metaphorical phrases, and then had to modify their usual talk about 'trusts,' as it became necessary to make out that the trust, which sticks to an unbroken advowson, somehow falls to pieces as soon as a single presentation is cut from it by purchase; notwithstanding the transparent fact, that the old patron is exactly in the same position as to all future presentations as if he had given instead of sold the first. Especially as it has become more and more common for early possession to be given, by 'an honourable understanding,' which is perfectly lawful, and *not* 'an evasion of the law,' as it is absurdly called, or, still more absurdly, 'simoniacal,'—simony being just what the law calls such, and no more.

We shall very likely astonish a good many people by telling them, what they can verify for themselves in the 'Life of Bishop Lonsdale' (if they can get it), that two such notorious heretics as he and Bishop Blomfield considered the thing called simony by Acts of Parliament absolute nonsense. First, the buying of a particular sphere of action for a man who must have been twice ordained, and declared fit for any ordinary cure, might better have been called Magic, if it is supposed to have any relation to Simon Magus, who wanted to buy the gift of the Holy Ghost and the power of doing miracles. Secondly, by the law of England simony is not simony, if it is conjoined with gambling, or speculating on another man's death. It only becomes simony when the gambling is removed, or the expectation has become a certainty and the living is absolutely vacant. Thirdly, a moral certainty is not enough to make a transaction simony. It has been decided that, if the incumbent lives five minutes after his living is sold, the purchase is not simony. He may have been given another living to which he only waits to be instituted till the patron has sold the next presentation of his present living; and this is perfectly lawful, and nobody has any right to call it simony; it would be libellous to do so. Yet nine out of ten of the people, who offer their opinions to these Committees and Commissions and the public, talk as glibly as if it were either in the Bible or an Act of Parliament, that buying with an 'understanding' that an incumbent who wants

to resign will resign soon, is 'a simoniacal evasion of the law.' The Primate went farther, and actually said it is 'against the law.' Where he got his law from we can only guess, viz. from his own opinion of what it ought to be.

In fact 'simony' has become a mere nickname for any mode of buying a living without gambling for it; and for almost every kind of transaction for obtaining a presentation that the talker about it thinks something like what is simony by law. And it appears by the evidence, that one consequence of all this confusion of ideas is, that some excellent men with tender consciences are afraid of buying livings at all, if they know to whom they mean to give them, nor will similarly weakly conscientious presentees accept them. And actually this Bill further proposes to make presentees 'solemnly and sincerely declare that I have not received the presentation in consideration of any money, profit, benefit, &c., directly or indirectly given by me, or by *any person* with my knowledge or consent, to any person whatsoever.' So, if a man knows, as of course he does if it has happened, that he receives the presentation in consequence of his father having given money for it to the former patron (who is certainly 'any person whatsoever'), he must either solemnly and sincerely make that declaration in some non-natural sense or abandon the living. Yet, we are told, it is quite a misapprehension to imagine, that this Bill has any tendency to injure private patronage.

It is also to be observed that the injury to patrons by abolishing resignation bonds just affects that class of patrons whom the bishops profess to cherish most, and not the buyers of next presentations at all. The Commission of 1877, which went much too far in some things, did not attempt all this robbery; for though they did propose to abolish resignation bonds by name, they preserved the thing (in a very clumsy way, to be sure) by proposing that the nominee of the patron should have the living when he was ripe for it, but that meanwhile it shall be held by a man appointed, not by the patron, but by the bishop, who is to be called 'curate' instead of vicar: which is obviously just the same, except that the patronage for the meantime is stolen from the patron and given to the bishop. The present Bill robs the patron of his right to appoint the man he wants, if he is not ready in the nick of time when the living falls vacant. There was good reason for removing the temptation to put in a stop-gap who was expected to die in time; and it is not to be forgotten that the Act of 1829 for so doing was passed at the request of the Primate of that day, though the Primate of this day wants to repeal it.

By

By the Act of 13 Anne c. 11, clergymen were for the first time forbidden to present themselves if they had bought the next presentation only: one of those foolish and arbitrary and abortive pieces of meddling which sometimes get through Parliament without anybody foreseeing its consequences, or the wideness of the breach through which coaches can and will be driven. So, because that Act has been a failure, while the resignation Act has been a success and a benefit to the Church, the present bishops want to repeal the successful, and to extend the unsuccessful Act, besides repealing practically the whole law of English patronage from the time when parishes were first founded and churches endowed, and to hand over their own functions to a mixed elected presbytery and parochial councils; and then they complacently assure patrons, and the clergy, that the Bill will do them no harm, but rather good. Thus far they have been believed, and perhaps will continue to be so, until all three parties, bishops, patrons, and parsons, find out that the bishops have been 'boring holes in the ship,' the parsons clapping their hands (like little children in a carriage run away with), and the patrons asleep.

The notorious decline in the net value of livings, due to a variety of causes, such as loss of rents, fall in the corn averages, increased taxation (which is sure to become worse if we are to have local government everywhere), more churches to serve, and more services to give, makes the want of moderately rich clergymen greater every year. Can any man in his senses, after reading these pages, doubt that such a measure as this Bill will frighten such men away in every direction? There is not a single thing in it that does not tend to do so. We have not room to summarize the items, and those who have read thus far attentively will need no summary. *A fortiori*, we have not room to quote any of the evidence, as we should like to have done. But we must just refer to the dissentient reports of two Commissioners of 1877, who were extremely different in their views both of theology and politics, and in their condition of life, Lord Devon and Lord Justice James; the latter going into the Commission with an opinion very different from that which he adopted after hearing the evidence. Having read it ourselves, we are not surprised at that strong and clear-headed judge being converted by the futile and illogical attempts of the witnesses to make out their theory of a reserved right being a trust, and of any real distinction between selling one future presentation and selling many; or of any real evil in *bonâ fide* sales of next presentations; or that *malâ fide* sales cannot be defeated by proper examination, when the proper authority, the bishop and his officers,

officers, are enabled to make it. The Lord Justice has saved us from the necessity of giving any judgment on the evidence, by his short summing up of it: 'I am not satisfied by the evidence that there is any sufficient ground for such an interference with the existing legal right of the owners of advowsons to dispose of them absolutely or partly as may seem best to them.' We may however add, that neither in the evidence before the Commission, nor in the previous Committee, was there any attempt to establish, as a fact, that incumbents who come in by the purchase of next presentations are inferior on the average to any other class, whether under episcopal, or public, or inherited patronage; and there is strong evidence from some persons that they are not inferior, but, for obvious reasons, they are very often quite the contrary. Our own recent experience or observation is the same, though we can remember when it was otherwise. But the habits of incumbents are much changed since those times; and few men go into Orders now who do not fully intend to do their best.

Lord Devon expressed views so similar to our own on this subject, that we will only quote this very striking opinion, from so large a landowner, and so strong a Churchman, a man of so much experience as a Chairman of Committees in both Houses, and so accustomed to criticize Bills and clauses closely. He dissented from the general report, 'Because the sale of next presentations places the power of exercising patronage in *other hands than landowners*' (the very people whom the bishops and their Bill exclude without special licence from the Inquisition), 'and thus to create in persons not possessing any hereditary connection with land not only an interest in the well-being of the Church as an establishment, but also a desire to promote its efficiency as an appointed instrument for the diffusion of religious truth.' And he believes that the evils of trafficking in presentations can be obviated by measures even short of what we have been suggesting in the way of control by the bishops; and *à fortiori* by them.

Of course it will be said by the defenders of the Bill, and by people who attend to no details, that Lord Devon, Lord Justice James, and ourselves, are less likely to be right than the Committees of 1886 and 1874 and the Commission of 1879 as a whole. *A priori*, that may be so; and it may also be as wrong as such *à priori* probabilities often are, and worthless as they always are as soon as we have reached experience. If the Archbishop or his supporters can show our exposure of his Bill to be wrong, let them try. The time is past for probabilities. Fortunately, or unfortunately, we have had experience enough

enough of the value of 'great expectations' in ecclesiastical Reform Bills. The Public Worship Bill excited twenty times the interest of this Church Patronage Bill, on which there has never been a real debate at all—only conversation. The greatest people had their fingers in that pie, and made it what it is—Prime Ministers, Chancellors, Archbishops and Bishops, Lord Shaftesbury, the leader of the party who most wanted it to work effectively. General Orders were made under it by such a conclave of dignitaries as never signed any legal orders before. And yet from beginning to end it is the greatest muddle and set of technical pitfalls that ever was 'turned out' by the great legislative machine; and it has sunk into premature decay already. The Veto, given to bishops for the first time in 1840, and continued, through their strong demand for it, in 1874, has turned out as we have said above. The Clerical Pensions Act has produced gross injustice and many complaints; and has sometimes given twice the intended proportion of the net value of a living to a lazy retiree who does not need it, and whose health is miraculously cured. That most unnecessary Dilapidation Act of 1871, mended, as usual, in 1872, which was welcomed by the clergy as a boon, is found to be their curse. It has been absolutely condemned by a Committee of the House of Commons; and is nothing but an Act for the constant repair of architects and surveyors, as knowing people predicted it would be. Yet not a bishop lifts a finger to repeal it. The blunders of the Clergy Discipline Act, in which the Government of the day foolishly yielded to Bishop Phillpotts after they had beaten him (as we described in the before-mentioned article), are notorious by this time. Attempts to enable bishops to license other clergymen to officiate in the parish (though not in the church) of an incumbent not bad enough to be removed, but who may be doing all he can over many square miles to destroy the Church of England, always fail somehow, because the bishops never cordially support them.

We need not go on. After these things we had better hear no more about the *à priori* probabilities, that an episcopal Bill that has got through a large Committee is more likely to be good, than criticisms on it are likely to be right. If experience is worth anything in this age of theoretical reforms, the probability is adverse to this Bill. We are not going on probabilities alone, but on demonstration of far more alarming and injurious qualities in the Church Patronage Bill than even those in the Public Worship Act and the others we have named.

- ART. VIII.—1. *Handbuch der historisch-geographischen Pathologie.* Von Dr. August Hirsch; 2te vollständig neue Bearbeitung. 3 Bände. Stuttgart, 1881–86.
2. *Handbook of Geographical and Historical Pathology.* By Dr. August Hirsch. Translated by Charles Creighton, M.D. 3 vols. London, 1883–86. (New Sydenham Society.)

A WELL-KNOWN Edinburgh physician of the last generation, one of a philosophical school distinguished by the largeness of their ideas and the lucidity of their style, used to say that he 'thought it more than probable that, in fifty or a hundred years, the business of a physician will not be regarded in England as either a learned or a liberal profession.' Learned and liberal are, of course, words that take new meanings according as the subject-matter of knowledge changes. Confining the application to strictly professional accomplishments, these qualities may be justly claimed for the physicians and surgeons of the present generation who are well versed in physiological and pathological research. When we compare, however, the recent medical literature of England with that of other countries, we shall have to confess that Dr. Gregory's prophecy has to a certain extent come true. As a mere matter of contemporary observation, it is impossible not to be struck with the paucity of modern English books on the historical development and continuity of medical doctrine and practice, on the great national outbreaks of sickness, and on the distribution of diseases in other countries than our own.

In the English medical book-market of recent years we find no great history of medicine, no great history of epidemics, no great geography of disease, no great climatology. Since Freind's 'History of Physic from the time of Galen' (which he began during a political imprisonment in the Tower, and never finished), it is difficult to name any English work of the kind, except Dr. Meryon's 'History of Medicine,' vol. i., 1861, an agreeable enough essay on a few epochs of medicine, but hardly to be taken seriously as a work of historical research. After Meryon, we have the useful historical sketch at the beginning of Forbes's 'Cyclopædia of Medicine,' compiled in part by Bostock, and in part by Alison. Epidemiological history is represented by Bascome's thin octavo on the 'History of Epidemic Pestilences from the Earliest Ages,' 1851, which is in the form of annals, and suggests the learned ease ('pottering' is the vulgar term) of a retired practitioner, rather than the 'Ernst der ins Ganze geht' that distinguishes the best works of the foreign press.

It may be nothing against the title of English medicine to be accounted learned and liberal, that it is profoundly indifferent about a new edition of 'Galen.' Such indifference may be no more than that 'brutalité de sens commun' which has been discovered to be a national characteristic. We should be taking up a weak position if we stood upon the neglect of a Greek classic; but the neglect of historical development and continuity is a very different matter. Is there in England no rational curiosity about the history of medicine, nor any interest in the shiftings of medical doctrine and practice? However this may be, we have no English modern history of medicine, nor even a translation of a foreign work. Or if the book-market be not an absolutely safe index of our state, we may consider what we do, compared with other countries, in those monographs on various restricted topics which enthusiastic, uncommercial scholars are induced to publish. Even our own historical pestilence, the English 'Sweating Sickness,' has received its modern elucidation at the hands of Gruner and Hecker and Häser. We have, indeed, a translation, fifty years old, of Hecker's essay on the Black Death; but our more recent share in the study of that tremendous episode in the history of the human race has been borne for us by Mr. Thorold Rogers, in his 'History of Agricultural Prices in England;' and by the Rev. Dr. Jessop, in his recent articles on the 'Black Death in East Anglia,' published in the 'Nineteenth Century.' Apart from some excellent monographs by the Anglo-Indian branch of the profession, and Theophilus Thompson's 'Annals of Influenza,' the most notable piece of English work of that kind, which is always honourably noticed by foreign scholars, is Sir J. Y. Simpson's 'Antiquarian Notes on Leprosy in the British Islands,' published more than forty years ago in a series of papers in the 'Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal.'

If these things are thought to be remote in practical interest, as they are certainly remote in time, there are peculiarly British opportunities for utilitarian and historic study. It can hardly be a matter of reproach to the medical profession of England, that they have allowed Germany to anticipate them in the production of the book that gives occasion to our remarks. A German professor has not only written the treatise on 'Geographical and Historical Pathology;' it has fallen to a German professor to give form and method to that science. Previous to Dr. Hirsch's first edition (1860-64), no such comparative science existed. Materials, indeed, there were, in hundreds of books and thousands of memoirs and papers at hand, but no master workman was at hand. In the preface to the first volume

of

of his re-written work (1881), Professor Hirsch says : 'The task that I had imposed upon myself was not merely to collect and reduce to order an almost unmanageable heap of materials, and to test critically their authenticity and fitness ; but more particularly it involved the founding according to a design, and the building up according to a system, of a discipline that had been the subject of but little labour before, and had still to make good its right to a place among the Medical Sciences.' There does not appear to be any good reason for abating one jot of the author's pretensions. Of his immense bibliographical knowledge there is no question ; his private library at Berlin, containing some thirty thousand volumes, is known among medical bibliophiles for its very complete sets of archives, journals, transactions, and annual reports, in every language, and dating from the earliest days of concerted medical research. Many English readers will learn for the first time from this work, how busy their countrymen of former generations had been, both at home and abroad, in recording their observations, and how considerable a proportion of their books and essays was translated into German. It will give some idea of Dr. Hirsch's bibliographical resources, when we say, that his chapter on Malarial Fevers is followed by an alphabetical list of some eight or nine hundred writers, his chapter on Yellow Fever by a list of some six or seven hundred, and that his account of the remarkable epidemics of diphtheria in Spain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is annotated with references to obscure contemporary Spanish books, most of which have a place on his own shelves.

It is the unusual combination of extensive bibliographical range and methodical accuracy, with intellectual grasp and philosophical insight, that has enabled Dr. Hirsch to become the founder of a new department of medical science. During the twenty years between his first and second editions, many hands have been at work on the building, but the originality of the design rests with himself. We shall have opportunities, in the sequel, of showing what sort of problems the science of geographical and historical pathology deals with. In the meantime, we shall venture on a few criticisms of the book.

One of the first things that will occur to a student of the work is, that this or the other disease is taken in the wrong place. For example, the chapter on Malarial Diseases comes in the first volume, among the Acute Infections, while the chapters on Dysentery and on Tropical Abscess comes in the third volume, among Diseases of Organs. Again, among the chronic infections, exception may be taken to the position of leprosy, which

has affinities rather to the class of slow constitutional disorders represented by pellagra. Goitre comes awkwardly among the chronic infections. For it, as well as for one or two others, there seems to be needed a new class of 'natural' endemic diseases, or diseases of locality due to the conditions of virgin nature. Cretinism in the offspring is too lightly assumed to be produced by the same cause as goitre in the parents. So far, indeed, as its geographical distribution is concerned, it is connected with goitre; but when its pathology is analysed, it is found to be a congenital disorder, or a tendency of development born with the child, and having in goitrous localities the same relation to an over-taxed function of child-bearing that rickets has to the same maternal strain elsewhere. From this point of view, it deserves a chapter to itself, a chapter that would have the farther interest of pointing out the goitrous localities where there is no cretinism, such as are nearly the whole extensive goitrous region of the New World.

When the ground is next gone over, it is probable that the divisional boundaries will be altered. Thus the inadequate idea of the present generation, that the various species of disease have been reproduced *ab æterno* by means of infective particles with absolute or fixed properties, will be supplanted by the evolutionary doctrine, which will assign an increasing number of these species to the several physiological disorders out of which they had remotely sprung. Dr. Hirsch's placing of diphtheria, whooping-cough, and several other epidemic maladies in his third volume ('Diseases of Organs'), is therefore a step in the right direction; and in the arrangement of his subject as a whole, he has placed himself beyond the reach of serious cavil, not only by reminding us that cross-divisions are inevitable, but also by the workmanlike way in which he finds a place for all the data of each disease. To a future generation of philosophical writers on disease, these volumes will be the indispensable '*mémoires pour servir.*' To contemporary readers they are not merely an ample presentation of the facts, and a serviceable clue to bibliographical sources, but they have an undercurrent of good sense and fairness of mind, which is, at any rate, a convenient substitute for the more penetrating judgment that comes of large principles firmly grasped and boldly applied.

The English translation by Dr. Creighton, of which the last volume has recently appeared, is appropriately brought out in the series of the New Sydenham Society. One can hardly imagine a book more in the spirit of Sydenham's own aims and achievements. It is his favourite theme, the Natural History

History of Disease, enriched a hundredfold with new facts and ideas. In presence of this modern wealth of knowledge, gathered from every period of history, and from every latitude and race, Sydenham's own pioneering '*Observationes Medicæ*' appear as the mere gropings of one confined within a narrow space. Even his broadest generalization of an 'epidemic constitution' of the air, varying from year to year and from season to season, receives but little recognition from modern epidemiologists; although Häser, throughout his third volume, is clearly reluctant to abandon it. But Sydenham's method has been fully vindicated. His comparison of diseases, marked by a special type, with the species of living things, each with its natural-history characters and habitat, continues to be our most fruitful analogy. Also in his preference for the study of the 'conjunct and proximate causes,' instead of the remote causes, he will eventually be found to have shown practical wisdom; although the tendency is now to dwell upon causes that are neither conjunct nor proximate. The conjunct and proximate cause was the complete natural history and external circumstances of the disease-species itself.

Like the natural species of animals and plants, each of the great historic pestilences or other forms of national sickness has had a certain conformity of type in all the thousands and tens of thousands of individual cases—a conformity which is made the more striking by the occurrence, within certain limits, of variations from the type. Each type, again, has had its native habitat; it has been in some peculiar way associated with its environment—with the climate, or with the telluric characters of the region, or with racial, social, and domestic habits, as if it had its place in a local flora or fauna of disease. Besides this analogy of geographical distribution, there is the other and even more remarkable analogy of succession in time. Old types have disappeared absolutely from certain regions, or are missed in certain newer strata of civilization; while new types have come in their place. There are diseases, such as the plague, that have been gradually driven from an almost universal prevalence among civilized men into remote corners and mountain fastnesses; other diseases, like the cholera, have in their turn emerged from the narrow limits of their habitat to overrun both hemispheres. If it be premature to say, that any old-world pestilence is as extinct as the mammoth, there are certainly some that have vanished as completely as the hyæna from Europe, and there are still others that are now as rare as the lynx or the elk. Asiatic cholera is curiously like the brown rat; less than a hundred years ago it began its migrations from the

the East, and there are few countries of either hemisphere to which it has not found its way; like the brown rat, too, it first effected a landing on European soil, by swimming the Volga and establishing itself in Astrakhan.

But, if we are to speak of the species of disease as we speak of the species of living things, comparing them in their specific characters, in their native habitats, their migrations, their succession upon the globe, and their present geographical distribution, we must at the same time be careful to note where the analogy fails.

One of the points of difference between the species of disease and the species of animals or plants was correctly appreciated by a versatile physician, Sir J. Y. Simpson, in his 'Antiquarian Notes on Leprosy in the British Islands,' to which we have already made reference. Speaking of the succession of disease-species, he says:*

'In pursuing such an enquiry the pathologist labours under comparative disadvantages. The physiologist can, by the aid of geological research, prove that the individual species of plants and animals inhabiting this and other regions of the earth have again and again been changed. The pathologist has no such demonstrative data to show that, in the course of time, the forms and species of morbid action have undergone great mutations, like the forms and species of normal life. But still we have strong grounds for believing that, in regard to our own individual species alone, the diseases to which mankind are subject have already undergone, in some respects, marked changes within the historic era of medicine. . . . It might be easy to show that, if the particular diseases of particular animal species are liable to alteration at all, they must necessarily alter more frequently than those animal species themselves.'

As a matter of fact, historical research shows, that the rise and extinction of successive new types of widespread or national sickness (not to mention those 'new and rare diseases' of which Sir James Paget has treated in his Bradshaw Lecture before the College of Surgeons in 1882) has been a more everyday and noticeable event than the origin of species in the animal and vegetable kingdoms. As Simpson says, our data are restricted to the period of written records; and yet, within that short span, and even within brief sections of it, we may here and there follow a species of pestilence from its rise to its extinction, or at any rate its apparent extinction; or, in the more usual case, we may assign to a particular year, or decade, or century, on good historical evidence, the origin of species of disease which are at the present day widely prevalent in one part of the

* 'Edin. Med. and Surg. Journal,' vol. lxvi., 1841.

world or another. Let us, then, turn from these generalities to particular instances.

The English sweating sickness came and went, beyond all question, between the years 1485 and 1551. It broke out suddenly in August of the former year among the troops, or perhaps only among those who had to do with the troops, of the Earl of Richmond (afterwards Henry VII.) between his landing at Milford Haven on the 7th of the month and the battle of Bosworth on the 22nd. Within four weeks of the victory, the new pestilence was raging in London, and, judging from casual notices, it seems to have overrun the whole country before the end of the year, visiting each locality with the same panic and disaster as the capital, and carrying off many in the well-to-do ranks of life. No one had seen such a disease before in England, nor, so far as we know, anywhere else. It struck down hundreds as if at a blow, giving hardly any warning of its approach; it either finished its victims in a few days, or left them at the end of its course to recover slowly from a state of extreme prostration; it seldom stayed more than a week or two in one place, vanishing as mysteriously as it came, and passing quickly from village to village or from town to town. The onset was usually in the night, with a chill followed by the hot fit; those stricken laboured under oppression at the heart and in the breathing, sickness of the stomach and headache; in the course of a few hours the skin became turgid, and a profuse sweating began, to subside gradually after twenty-four or forty-eight hours, or to end in total collapse and death in a state of coma ('somnia et inevitabilis stupor'). The mortality has not been estimated, but there is no doubt that it was very great.

After a perfectly clear interval of twenty years, the same malady broke out again in London in 1506, but did not reach the same diffusion or severity of type as in the former epidemic. It appeared for the third time in July 1517, again starting from London; and now it was more disastrous even than it had been originally. 'This time,' says Hecker, 'it was so violent and swift that it made an end of its victims in two or three hours. No warnings announced it; many who were brisk in their business at noon, were before evening no more among the living.' The gaieties of the Court and festivals of the Church were suspended until after Christmas, when the epidemic came to an end. It lasted six months in all, reaching its highest point in the first six weeks; and it is conjectured that it spread over all England, but without crossing the border to Scotland or St. George's Channel to Ireland. Among those who witnessed it was Sir Thomas More, who speaks of it in letters to Erasmus.

Hitherto

Hitherto the sweating sickness had occurred exclusively on English soil. But on its next appearance in 1528, after a clear interval of eleven years, it was destined to take a wider range. It broke out in the last days of May among the most crowded streets and lanes of London; and with the same appalling suddenness as before. The King, Henry VIII., left the capital, and after moving from place to place for a time, at length shut himself up at Tytynhangar within a circle of bonfires. By midsummer in the following year, there was hardly a country of Western Europe, except France, that had not become familiar with the 'English sweat.' Much of our best information on the medical aspects of the pestilence, and on its strange variations in severity and in the speed of its flight, is derived from the records of this foreign invasion. For the next twenty-three years following there was no trace of sweating sickness in any part of England or of Europe, but it broke out suddenly at Shrewsbury on the 15th of April, 1551. This was its last appearance; by the end of September it had ceased everywhere in England, never to revive. It came now with its old suddenness, and in the valley of the Severn it was so disastrous and universal that the people thought the air was poisoned. It was the same strange 'epidemic constitution' that was often seen in the early days of plague in Italy, and in some of the more calamitous outbreaks of yellow fever and of cholera. Armstrong's 'Art of Preserving Health' has an almost scientifically accurate intuition of its conditions:—

'The all-surrounding heaven, the vital air
Is big with death; and tho' the putrid south
Be shut, tho' no convulsive agony
Shake from the deep foundations of the world
The imprisoned plagues, a secret venom oft
Corrupts the air, the water, and the land.'

The celebrated Dr. John Kaye, or Caius, was an eye-witness of this last outbreak; and his words are: '*Ubique lugubris erat lamentatio, fletus mœrens, acerbus luctus.*'

'Thus,' says Professor Hirsch, 'the English sweat, with its five outbreaks within the period from 1486 [1485] to 1551, forms a completed episode in the history of pestilence. Just as it appeared suddenly in 1486 [1485] as a malady unknown to the doctors or the public, so in 1551 it went clean away from the earth and from men's memories, leaving no trace. Not until two hundred years after do we again meet with epidemic outbreaks of a kind of sweating sickness, which, if not identical with the English sweat, is still nearly related to it in every respect.'

This

This modern form, with most suggestive points of resemblance to the English pestilence, and with no less instructive points of difference, is the 'suetie des Picards,' a malady that has been more or less mildly endemic, or epidemic at brief intervals, among the small towns or market villages between Paris and the Channel coast, since the year 1718 down to recent years, if not actually to the present day; and has had a gradual extension, with occasional severe epidemics, from that original focus over some other provinces of France (Burgundy, the Vosges, Languedoc, and Provence). It has been seen also in Northern Italy, and in a limited area of the south-west of Germany, where it was probably native or autochthonous, just as it had been in Northern France.

Now, this reappearance of sweating sickness is noteworthy; there can hardly be a question that it is essentially the same type or species of disease that, first in 1485, became a devastating pestilence among the English. The modern form has hardly ever been extensively disastrous. For the most part, and in its original seats in Northern France, it has been a mild trouble of the *petite bourgeoisie*, and led a rather obscure existence in small towns and market villages. Even when, at intervals of a few years, it had risen to the height of an epidemic, it was generally restricted to a single village. The wider the epidemic, the more it resembled the historic English pestilence—save that the attacks were seldom fatal. In the suddenness of the onset in the individual, in the simultaneous incidence upon large numbers (one-third or even two-thirds of the inhabitants of a locality), in the equally sudden cessation after a week or two, in the immunity of the children and often of the very poor, in the absence of personal contagion, and in a close correspondence in the peculiar train of symptoms and after-effects, the likeness to the English sweat is unmistakable. The point of difference raised by Hecker, that the modern form lasts about a week in the individual, whereas the English form was over, one way or the other, in forty-eight hours, is by no means of general value, and would seem to apply principally to the more endemic cases.

We shall here put together some facts connecting the English sweat with the Picardy sweat, which have escaped the notice of Professor Hirsch, and, in their full application, have also escaped the notice of Hecker and other original authorities. The English sweating sickness came in the train of the Earl of Richmond's foreign levies, with which he defeated Richard III. on Bosworth Field. The date of the outburst was after the 7th of August, when the expedition landed at Milford Haven, and before the 22nd of August, when the battle was fought in Leicestershire.

Richmond

Richmond brought two thousand men with him from Havre in a few crowded ships. They were notoriously the scum of France. When they landed in Wales after a seven days' passage, their condition excited general contempt. Philip de Comines says they were the most wretched soldiery he ever beheld. Shakspeare has put the tradition into the mouth of Richard III. in his rousing speech before the battle, although he ignores the fact, that Richmond had been joined by three thousand English and Welsh:—

'Remember whom you are to cope withal:—
 A sort of vagabonds, rascals, runaways,
 A scum of Breagnes, and base lackey peasants,
 Whom their o'er-cloyed country vomits forth
 To desperate ventures and assur'd destruction. . . .
 Let's whip these stragglers o'er the seas again;
 Lash hence these overweening rags of France,
 These famish'd beggars, weary of their lives;
 Who, but for dreaming on this fond exploit,
 For want of means, poor rats, had hang'd themselves:
 If we be conquer'd, let men conquer us,
 And not these bastard Breagnes, whom our fathers
 Have in their own land beaten, bobb'd and thump'd.'

The designation of 'Breagnes' can hardly be accurate. Richmond had spent twelve years, no doubt, in the dominion of the Duke of Brittany, and was furnished by that sovereign in 1483 with a force of Bretons wherewith to wrest the English crown from the usurper Gloster. But the expedition was driven back to Dieppe, and fell to pieces. Richmond then betook himself to Paris; and there can be hardly any question that the force, with which he sailed from Havre two years later on the 23rd of July, 1485, was recruited, in addition to a small bodyguard given him by Charles VIII., from the peasants, vagrants, and gaol-birds of the country between Paris and the Channel coast. In other words, his foreign troops must have come from that very region where the 'suetie des Picards' showed itself as an indigenous disease, or disease of the soil, more than two hundred years later.

Having got thus far, the enquirer must proceed warily. Nothing is easier than to assume, that the sweating sickness existed in Normandy and Picardy at the time; that it existed in the persons of Richmond's mercenaries; that it spread from them to the English, and so became an English pestilence. But that would be merely playing with the superficial aspects of the problem. There was certainly no question of sweating sickness in the north of France until 1718, when its outbreak was so unaccountable

accountable as to lead the people to fancy, that it had been carried by the wind from Flanders or across the sea. Again, it is not certain that Richmond's foreigners suffered from sweating sickness. They were in a miserable plight when they landed; they were marched at an exhausting pace from Milford Haven to Lichfield in hot weather; and yet, with the help of some three thousand men who had hastily joined the standard in Wales, they turned the tide of battle against a force of Englishmen twice as numerous. That does not look as if the sweating sickness had been raging among them, although we know that its outbreak preceded the battle. Besides, it was generally remarked in the later English epidemics, that the foreigners resident in the country escaped. It is remarkable, also, that France was conspicuously avoided by the epidemic of 1528-29, which spread from England over the whole of Germany, the Low Countries, and the shores of the Baltic. The French escaped, but the English in Calais had their share.

These facts are not without many analogies in the history of spreading sickness both among men and brutes. They open up a striking chapter in the history of the operations of nature. Contact between men of different races, or nationalities, or of widely different antecedents and habits, or between cattle of different breed and condition, is attended with a certain risk of something passing from the one to the other. The contact may become a contagion, under certain circumstances; which are, first, that the contact shall be, generally speaking, of men or cattle herded together, a contact *en masse*; and secondly, that the race, nationality, or social stratum whence the contagion springs, shall have been inured to hardships, or to noxious habits of living, which have wrought slow and subtle effects upon their own health. Let a body of such miserable strangers and aliens be brought into contact with a population differing from them in many respects, racial or national, or social or domestic, and an epidemic of acute sickness arises. The pestilence is not for those who had really engendered it; it falls upon those who are at the opposite pole of well-being, of physical health, and of racial character. This suffering because of others must have been the meaning, behind the sprinkled lintel and doorposts of Israel in Egypt; and it is a meaning that could be illustrated by examples not remote from our own day. The doctrine is one that men have been slow to grasp, and perhaps slow to accept; for there is often, although not always, a humiliating touch of Nemesis in it. There are few things in the physical and moral order of the world more marvellous than this vicarious principle.

If

If we accept the theory, that mere contact with the filthy and wretched of another race or class sometimes makes contagion, the question remains, why the ensuing epidemic sickness should have a distinctive and particular type, and why it should conform to certain modes of diffusion? Most diseases caused by human effluvia are of the sudden and prostrating kind; and it is to that class that sweating sickness may be said to belong. But what is it that defines its species? The answer to this question will depend upon the fact assumed, of the sweating sickness being an indigenous disease of the small towns and villages of North-Eastern France. Conditions of living that engendered an endemic disease, about the year 1718, had doubtless been going on long before; the peasants and vagabonds of that region, when taken to England in 1485, either, under the sudden change of conditions, developed this disease in their own bodies, or, more probably, the mere effluvia and exuviae of their bodies caused the disease in others. If the disease were merely potential in them at that time, it may be said to have been at the same date merely potential also in their homes or on their native soil. That which came to sudden development in 1485 by contact with another nationality, came also to maturation in 1718, after two hundred years of slow fermenting amidst the original conditions. The only other point that we shall mention, before quitting the subject, is that the '*suetie des Picards*' is peculiar in the selection of its victims. Its preference is not for the poor or the very filthy, but for their more comfortable neighbours:—

'The disease has been repeatedly prevalent,' says Professor Hirsch, 'in communes distinguished by their cleanliness, by the adequate ventilation of their streets and houses, the well-being and sobriety of life of their inhabitants, and by other favouring hygienic factors; while other communes near them, and far inferior to them in all hygienic matters, have escaped. Wherever it has appeared, it has attacked rich and poor in equal proportions; it has indeed happened not rarely that the proprietary class has furnished a larger contingent of the sick than those suffering from scarcity and want. . . . Aggregation of large masses of people in narrow and ill-ventilated spaces, such as barracks, prisons, hospitals, schools and the like, so far from proving favourable to the development and diffusion of miliary fever, would even appear to have exerted an antagonistic influence.'

And an opinion is quoted, relating to the epidemic of 1851 at one of its original seats in Picardy (Dep. Somme):—

'The miliary fever had this peculiarity, that it showed itself to be most severe wherever the hygienic conditions appeared to be the best.'

When

When Asiatic cholera came first to Europe in 1831, there were those, like the ingenious Hufeland, who at once remarked an analogy between it and the English sweating sickness. It was observed, also, by a good many French writers, that the cases of 'suette des Picards' were occasionally complicated with true choleraic symptoms; while the still more interesting observation was made in the French cholera epidemics of 1832 and 1849, that the sweating disease, which had been quiet for several years, at once received a great accession of strength, keeping company, in its native districts, with cholera in the most unmistakable manner, so that, as one writer puts it, they were 'almost inseparable companions.' But more particular evidence was yet to come. It happened to a young medical officer (Dr. John Murray, now Surgeon-General), stationed at Mhow in Malwa, to see during the rainy seasons of 1839 and 1840 a number of patients, whose disease began as if they were sickening for cholera (then epidemic in the neighbourhood although only sporadic at Mhow itself), but afterwards changed so distinctively to the form of a copious running sweat, that the author wrote a description of it in the 'Madras Quarterly Journal of Medical Science' under the name of the 'Malwa Sweating Sickness.' It was peculiar in the tendency to relapse, in the protracted convalescence, and in the embarrassed action of the heart which it left behind it. Dr. Murray's excellent and faithful description was recalled to mind nearly twenty years after by the occurrence of precisely similar cases in the company of true Asiatic cholera in the French fleet during the Crimean War, and subsequently at Toulon, and at other places in Provence and Languedoc. There has been a good deal of writing on this sweating hybrid of cholera; it has been named 'cholera cutané ou sudoral,' the true cholera being regarded 'comme une sorte de suette interne,' the running from the skin being equivalent to the intestinal profluvium, and both diseases alike due to a profound paralysis of the nervous mechanism that presides over the action of the blood-vessels and of the heart.

As a species of disease, Asiatic cholera itself has natural-history characteristics hardly less striking than those of sweating sickness. Previous to 1817, although it had destroyed some some twenty thousand pilgrims in a few days at the Hurdwar festival of 1783, it was not recognized, even by the shrewd Anglo-Indian practitioners, as one of the fixed or indigenous diseases of Bengal. It drew special attention to itself in the lower valley of the Ganges in the spring of 1817; and it appeared on enquiry that there had been an epidemic of it at Purneah (Behar) the year before. The outburst of 1817 became general throughout

throughout Lower Bengal; but a complete remission occurred from December of that year to March 1818, when the disease was again prevailing at Allahabad. That year marks its extension over the greater part of India, including the Deccan and the Punjaub; and the disease henceforth figures regularly among the indigenous maladies of the country. Whatever evidence may be found of cholera-outbreaks in former centuries (and Macpherson has collected no fewer than sixty-four), it can hardly be doubted that those of 1817, 1818, and subsequent years were a new departure, and very different from all previous outbreaks. More particularly the lower basins of the Ganges and Brahmapootra began after a time to be looked upon as the 'endemic area' of cholera. The disease now comes forth regularly season after season, 'as if it were a fruit of the earth;' and although it is more destructive one year than another, the annual mortality from it in Lower Bengal is always considerable. On the other hand, outside that area its visitations have been occasional, and of very various degrees of severity. The Punjaub and Upper Provinces have epidemics of cholera at intervals, just as Europe is from time to time invaded by it. The number of deaths from cholera in the Madras Presidency has ranged from the insignificant total of 313 in 1874 to the enormous figure of 357,430 in 1879. Beyond India, the hypothesis of continuous extension or of importation may account for an outbreak. The latest authorities include the alluvial basins of the Irrawaddy, Mekong, and other Eastern rivers side by side with the basins of the Ganges and Brahmapootra, as indigenous foci of the disease.

The 'endemic area' of cholera in the East is probably not more than seventy years old. There had, no doubt, been isolated outbreaks, especially during military operations, before that period; but not a regular tale of victims season after season at particular spots. Although the limits of the area of endemicity are somewhat vague, and have probably changed within the experience of men still living, the greater part of India remains liable, just as other countries of the globe are liable, to occasional outbreaks only of the disease. The great invasion of cholera throughout the world began within a few years of that remarkable establishment or domestication of the disease in Lower Bengal; but such general invasion has been always temporary. After describing the gradual progress of cholera from east to west through Central Asia, on the occasion of its first visit to Europe and America (it came no farther than Astrakhan on the previous occasion), Dr. Hirsch ends his long narrative of its foreign campaigns with these words:—

'The

'The winter of 1837-38 brings the second pandemic of cholera to a close; the disease died out during the winter at every point in the immense territory which it had overrun in the period from 1826 to 1837. For the next ten years the soil of Europe, Africa, and America was completely free from it.'

Again, when it landed at Toulon from Cochinchina in June 1884, there had been a clear interval of eleven years, during which no case had been reported from any part of Europe. It is said, indeed, that there has not been absolutely the same clean bill from Asiatic cholera in certain parts of Southern Russia as in the rest of the Europe; that there have been fitful outbreaks here and there among troops in garrison, as well as village epidemics in remote districts, which have not come to public notice. There is certainly no *prima facie* reason against a degree of domestication in alluvial and filth-sodden soil even in Europe.

Those who have conversed with Anglo-Indians on the subject of cholera will have observed, that their view of the disease is often entirely at variance with our European notions. To them cholera is an affair of unperceived emanations from the soil, which are more active at some seasons than at others. Within the endemic area the influence is nearly always present for those who lay themselves open to its attack. If its victims become more numerous for a time, in a village or district, there is an epidemic of it; but no one thinks of tracing the spread of the malady from person to person, or by intercourse from village to village. Even in the great epidemic outbursts in the Punjab and Upper Provinces, or in the Bombay and Madras Presidencies, it is only now and then that transmission by the sick from place to place is thought of. In the quiet course of its existence in Lower Bengal, cholera makes up its total of, say, fifty thousand deaths in the year, by taking off individuals here and there. New arrivals in the Hoogly; strangers passing through Calcutta; troops on the march who had camped on some likely spot; travellers who had slept in some notorious bungalow, or had moored their river-boat to a certain bank; villagers who have been indulging in a debauch, or who have been peculiarly exposed to chill, or who have been neglectful of some simple degree of catharsis; persons who have been incautious in the use of cathartic drugs, or have laid themselves open to attack in some other subtle and inscrutable way—these are the ordinary subjects of cholera in its native seats. Here and there one is taken and thousands are left; or, at the height of the cholera-season, the tale of victims is increased three- or four-fold; so that several cases come in close succession in the same cluster of huts

huts or in a number of villages in the same district or among the troops in a garrison, giving the semblance of an epidemic.

Some idea of the incidence of cholera in India, in one of its worst epidemics outside the native area, may be gathered from the following facts, recorded (along with many more equally instructive) by Surgeon-General J. M. Cunningham.* In 1882 the North-Western provinces suffered severely from cholera, the total deaths reaching the unprecedented figure of 89,372. In 10,838 of the whole 105,421 towns and villages within the area, cases of cholera were reported; these affected spots being distributed, on the whole, uniformly over the provinces. The average for each locality (although it may be somewhat misleading to strike an average) was a little over eight deaths in the season or year. Thus, the influence may be said to have been generally diffused over the length and breadth of the provinces; it caused deaths in one village or town out of every ten; and some 90,000 victims have to be distributed over nearly 11,000 centres. Whatever may have led to the selection of particular spots, and within these to the selection of particular persons, hardly any one in India believes that transmission by the sick explains the diffusion and distribution of the disease. When the disease travels from place to place, it travels like a mole underground; and this is, in fact, the inference that was forced upon those who watched the spread of cholera last year, from village to village in Murcia and other alluvial parts of Spain. It is as if a poison were diffused, not in the air, but in the pores of the ground; and it is clear that the mode of diffusion may be, in part at least, the same whether it extends by continuity from the borders of the endemic area in India, or whether the starting-point be a newly-created focus on European soil, made by a quantum of the virus there deposited. The experiences of the Madras Presidency suggest, that the real distinction is not between India and extra-Indian countries, but between the 'endemic areas' of cholera and all other parts of the globe. The Southern Presidency, which had only 313 deaths from cholera in 1874, had 357,430 deaths in 1877, out of a population of nearly twenty-nine millions; giving a higher death-rate than has ever been recorded for Bengal itself, or in the most appalling of the epidemics on European soil, such as those of Hungary in 1872-73, of Russia in 1871-72, and of Italy and Sicily in 1867.

It can hardly be doubted that Asiatic cholera, as a species of disease marked by such endemic and diffusive characters as these, has come into existence since the first twenty years of

* 'Cholera: What can the State do to prevent it?'—Calcutta, 1884, p. 18.

the present century. What then has been the aggravation of circumstances within that period? In seeking to answer the question, we must keep in mind the nature of the malady and its analogues. The site of an Indian religious festival has, until the more strict sanitary supervision of recent times, been often the scene of autochthonous outbursts of cholera. This is the natural consequence of soil and air charged with the excrementitious effluvia of a vast multitude; the true choleraic seizures being usually preceded, for a day or two, by a number of more ordinary cases of intestinal disorder, such as are known to be caused by filth-strewn ground in this country.* The endemicity of cholera in Lower Bengal means that the same state of soil which used to arise from time to time at the great religious fairs, has been gradually and permanently induced over a wide tract of soil in the basins and delta of the Ganges and Brahmapootra. There is indeed reason to suspect the existence throughout the country of such excrementitious pollution of the soil, due, first of all, to the personal habits of the villagers, which are the cause of that *odor stercoreus* that we read of as arising round a Bengali village. These habits are not peculiar to Bengal; but they are different from those of Western countries, and in one important respect from those of China. There is also a certain peculiar decomposition of human exuviae in the soil caused by the porous character of the surface layer of alluvium (ten feet deep), or of laterite; the presence of subsoil water close to the surface all over Lower Bengal; and the flooding of the ground during the rainy months of June, July, August, and September, and the drying of it at other seasons. The alternating seasons of rain and drought cause regular movements of the subsoil water up and down; movements which are known to favour decomposition of the organic matters in the soil, and to favour their exhalation into the air. Owing to the nearness of the subsoil water to the surface, the influence of all these movements is directly and speedily felt, instead of being remote or uncertain, as it would be if the stratum of underground water were at a greater depth. Such is the soil of the endemic areas of cholera; and such also is the soil that has been proved in innumerable cases to be the first seat of cholera when it comes to Europe.

But if these are the old characteristics of soil, season, and national habits that have been present in Bengal for generations, why should cholera have become endemic there only within the last seventy years? How is it that the excrementitious

* See the Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council for 1858-9, p. 60, and 1873, p. 12.

fouling of a vast tract of river-basin and delta has at length made inveterate what had previously been intermittent, and has made diffusive what had never before been heard of beyond India? We may perhaps entertain the idea of a cumulative action, or of gradual aggravation, or in a figure, of provocation beyond the limit of endurance. Whatever may have brought about the crisis in the early part of this century, it is worth keeping in mind that the number of persons supported on the soil of Lower Bengal may be taken, with good reason, to have increased greatly within the period of English rule; that the increase has been in the original village communities, and not in large towns; and that the heart of the endemic area of cholera is remarkable among the provinces of the globe for the enormous rural population that it carries, a population that is in many places seven hundred to the square mile, and in some places nearly a thousand.

If there be some uncertainty about the rise of cholera as a new species, with subsequent consolidation of its power, there is practically none about yellow fever. The residents of Barbadoes in 1647 included several educated men from England and from New England; and in the French possession of Guadaloupe there were settlers of the same class. In both islands the yellow fever broke out upon them disastrously as a 'nova pestis.' It is now proved beyond all doubt that yellow fever is not a form of mere climatic or malarial remittent fever; and it is generally admitted that its affinities are really to typhus fever. But it is typhus with a very remarkable difference, a typhus of the soil and mud of certain harbours of the New World. It goes with miasmatic exhalations, just as malarial fever is popularly supposed to do; but the emanations are felt at only a few spots on the surface of the globe, and those spots less malarious (being populous places) than the wide tracts of country around them. If there be anything in the natural history of the yellow fever species more striking than its sudden appearance on the stage of history about the middle of the seventeenth century, it is its altogether singular geographical distribution, together with its abandonment of some of its old seats and its settlement in new. It has been the scourge of West Indian harbours from the first, often decimating and even exterminating the crews of ships when it did not touch the inhabitants ashore; in the bay of Havana it has been known to find its way into a ship-of-war anchored in seven or eight fathoms, and to make havoc among her men for weeks after in the open sea. In the last century there was hardly an American port, from Rhode Island to Savannah, that did not have one or more visitations under the provocation

provocation of an unusually hot summer. During the present century it has almost left the Atlantic ports; while it has been active for many years, and is still seen from time to time, in New Orleans, Mobile, and the newer ports of Florida and Texas. The sluggish harbours of the Spanish Main have experienced it almost as long as the harbours of Cuba, Porto Rico, San Domingo, and the other Antilles, but to a lesser extent. Demerara has known it almost since it was first colonized. But in the ports of Brazil, its history dates quite definitely from 1849, and it had an equally definite beginning for the Peruvian ports in 1853. Meanwhile, in the Old World, it is absolutely unknown all over the East, and has hardly been seen anywhere except in occasional epidemics at two or three trading places on the West Coast of Africa, in some of the larger seaports of Spain, and at Lisbon.

The yellow-fever species, then, is an affair of ships and harbours; it came into being at a particular date; it soon showed that its chosen habitat was the harbour mud, wharves, and low sailors' quarters of certain ports of the New World; it left some of them after a time, remaining in others to the present day; it followed the course of trade to new ports; and it broke out from time to time in explosive outbursts at a few shipping places of the Old World, which were in direct correspondence with the tainted ports of the New. These are very definite natural-history characters; but there are more remarkable features still to be mentioned. If the disease is an affair of ships and harbours, it is as definitely an affair of tropical heat. And lastly, it has a character more marvellous than any other in the whole natural history of sickness—it absolutely avoids the negroes of pure blood, although they form a great part of the population in its endemic seats, and although the negro race is exceptionally prone to the other infective forms of disease.

Professor Hirsch, with his usual impartiality (or, as they say in Germany, 'objectivity'), enumerates with equal disapproval four hypotheses of the origin of this new species of disease. One is the 'madrepore hypothesis'—madrepores being salt-water animals that accumulate and putrefy in large numbers round the West Indian islands and the shores of the Gulf of Mexico. Another is the 'rotten-wood hypothesis,' of which we read: 'The view that the origin and reproduction of the poison is specially related to timber, has been particularly well received,' the timber being either part of the ship, or her cargo, or the structure of wharves and docks. The third is the 'bilge-water hypothesis,' or the theory that putrid bilge-

water, in any sort of filthy ship, may induce yellow fever, with the help of a hot season and a tropical climate. The fourth view is the 'slave-trade hypothesis,' which Professor Hirsch considers to be *abenteuerlich*. Boldness apart, we cannot but regard it as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the 'objective' method, to place such puerilities as madrepores, or rotten wood, or common foul bilge-water, on the same footing as the brilliant generalization of Audouard connecting yellow fever with the over-sea traffic in African negroes. The deeper one goes into particulars, the more solidly based does Audouard's hypothesis appear. The concurrence of testimony from all sides—from the clinical type or affinities of the disease, from the geography and the history, from ethnology and from ethics—connects yellow fever with the African slave-trade in as startling a manner as if some hand had written it for us on the wall.

Passing over a number of highly interesting species of acute disease (including dengue, or 'break-bone fever,' with its peculiar mixture of characters, suggesting sweating sickness or miliary fever, on the one hand, and rheumatic fever on the other, while its sudden and almost universal incidence on a population suggests influenza), let us take an instance of a new disease-species of a different kind—the pellagra of Lombardy and a few other localities.

About the middle of last century a strange disease began to occur among the peasantry of two somewhat circumscribed districts, very nearly on the same parallel of latitude, but separated by several meridians of longitude—the country round Oviedo in the Asturias, and the districts of Bergamo, Milan, and Brescia in Lombardy. The new disease was somehow associated with the field-labour in spring, and the most noticeable part of it was an eruption of red or livid swollen patches on the backs of the hands, on the face, or on other exposed parts of the body, with a feeling of tension or burning, from which the disease came to be called pellagra, or 'smarting skin.' The skin affection, which subsided at the end of summer to re-appear next spring, was but a small part of the trouble, as the sequel showed. Season after season the strength became less; mysterious disorders of the organic nerves began to show themselves, producing derangements of the digestion and circulation, and of vision; the unhappy peasant was gradually reduced to a kind of mummy, with all his angles protruding, and very often he ended his life either in fatuous imbecility, or in mania and suicide.

From its original small centre around Oviedo it gradually invaded other parts of the Asturias and other provinces of the north

north of Spain. At the same time, it became a feature of the peasant life over a steadily-increasing area of Lombardy; and before the end of the century it was settled in Venetia and the Emilia on one side of the Peninsula, and in Tuscany on the other; while the peasants of Piedmont and Liguria were more slightly affected by it, and not until a later date. The same remarkable species of disease began to show itself about the year 1818 in the Gironde, near Arcachon, and in a few years it was found in many villages of the Landes and Basses-Pyrénées. In 1846 it was found among the peasantry of certain parts of Roumania, and a few years later it occurred in so remote a spot as the island of Corfu. These are the seats of pellagra at the present day, the cases among the peasantry of Northern Italy being estimated to number about one hundred thousand, while they are proportionately less numerous in the other foci of the disease.

Several Commissions have enquired into the circumstances of this new species of disease, and hundreds of papers have been written on it. The uniformity of its type in several regions many leagues apart, among peasants of various nationalities and under different governments, has been found to depend upon the steady operation of a uniform cause, and that cause an obvious or common-sense one. There is no longer any doubt that pellagra is the slow, insidious, and cumulative effect of a staple diet of bad maize, of bread and porridge made from the poorer sorts of Indian corn grown on soils where it will not ripen perfectly, gathered in a wet state, badly husbanded, apt to decompose in the grain or flour, and still more apt to spoil in the ill-baked loaves of bread. It is not a maize-diet of itself, nor even an exclusive diet of maize, that gradually brings on the profound disorganization of the organic nervous system and of the higher nervous faculties; but it is a diet of damaged maize, such as is apt to fall to the share of the poorer peasants in those maize-growing countries of Europe where the climate is not always favourable to that sub-tropical cereal.

The circumstances in Corfu are peculiarly striking. Pellagra began to be seen there in more than occasional cases, just when the cultivation of the grape had replaced maize-growing in a good many of the communes. The old taste for maize-diet remained; and Indian corn, to supply the deficiency, was brought into the market from other countries. A large proportion of the imported maize has been shown to be an inferior article from the Danube, all the more likely to be damaged or decomposed from its long water-transit by the Black Sea.

Other illustrations of changing disease-species can only be mentioned.

mentioned. Thus leprosy has a history and natural history which have led to its being compared with one of the species of animated nature; it resembles pellagra in several points, and probably owns the same sort of origin in the habitual use of something semi-putrid or toxic in the food. There is also the strange tropical disease called 'beriberi,' belonging to the same constitutional group, which has been known in the East for ages, and suddenly made its appearance on a large scale in Brazil twenty years ago. Or, to pass to another group, there is the remarkable history of plague:—its devastations all over Europe as the Black Death of the fourteenth century; its subsequent outbursts down to the years 1665-70, when it abruptly ceased in the West; its career as Levantine plague throughout the eighteenth century and down to about the year 1840, when it retreated still farther off; its more recent campaigns for a time in Arabia and Mesopotamia; and its final withdrawal to the remote mountain villages on the Perso-Armenian frontier, where it was heard of not very long ago. Before plague declined in Western Europe, a disease not without close affinities to it, typhus fever, began to be common. It was a close attendant on the great wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it has been a rare disease since the battle of Waterloo, excepting in the form of famine-typhus in Ireland, Upper Silesia, Poland, and other areas of poor living. The more recent form of 'famine fever' is a near relation to typhus, namely, relapsing fever, which was first clearly diagnosed and named about the year 1840 in Glasgow, Dundee, and other towns. Although typhoid fever is perhaps not an absolutely new product of civilization, there is no question at all that it is much more common in this country now than it was fifty years ago; and there is a good deal of evidence for certain parts of the world, that it has come to the front in proportion as malarial fever has disappeared. Lastly, there is the strange history of diphtheria—the disastrous epidemics of it in Spain, under the name of 'garrotillo,' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, its extension to Italy, its fitful appearances in other countries, and its domestication in nearly every part of the civilized world since the years 1858-60.

These changing forms of specific disease, whether acute febrile, or chronic constitutional, have all of them something in their causation, however obscure it be, pointing to man's own sins of commission or of omission. But there are other great maladies, usually reckoned along with the former, which have had a certain fixity or invariability, which are somehow inevitable or proper to the struggle with Nature, incidental to the climate

climate of various parts of the globe, and to the geological and mineralogical characters of the crust of the earth. We shall refer in the briefest way to malarial fever, to goitre, and the Peruvian wart.

Malarial or climatic fever is the standing discouragement of explorers and first settlers; and throughout the tropical and subtropical zones generally it causes, in one way or another, more sickness and mortality than any other disease. Over a great part of the globe it needs only the primary alternations of sunshine and darkness, of heat and chill, of work and fatigue, along with some predisposition of the individual, to induce the fever of the country. Analyzed up to their simple factors, and cleared of all associations with imaginary 'malarial miasms,' which are as much an affair of superstition as the earlier entities of pixies and goblins, agues and remittents may be explained as nothing else than a disorder of the heat-regulating nervous mechanism of the body, which manifests itself in periodical paroxysms just as other disorders of nervous mechanism are apt to do.

While climatic fever is often an incident of localities which bear no traces of the hand of man, it has not less distinctively followed those great changes in the hydrology of provinces which have turned the once flourishing seats of empire into malarious deserts or swamps. One of the commonest causes of this kind has been the reckless clearing of the hills of their natural crown of woods; as in Mauritius, during the years immediately preceding the sudden outbreak and establishment of malarial fever in that island in 1866.

Next in importance to malarial fever is goitre, a malady which is doubtless as old as the occupation of mountainous countries by man. 'Who is surprised,' asks Juvenal,* 'at swollen necks in the Alps?' 'Quis tumidum guttur miratur in Alpibus?' Ranking in importance beside the Alps as the endemic home of goitre, we find the whole range of the Cordilleras of America, from New Mexico to Chili, and a great part of the range of the Himalayas; and in a lower rank, numerous smaller mountain chains in Europe, Asia, and Africa, such as the Vosges, the Pyrenees, the Carpathians, the Ural, the Caucasus, the basin of the Lena, the Altai range, the Atlas, the Greater Soudan, and the basin of the Niger. What it is that causes goitre in the men, and more particularly in the women, of these mountain valleys (with the secondary result of cretinism in a small proportion of the children), is a profoundly

* Sat. xiii. 162.

interesting question, which will be found to offer unequalled opportunities for the application of the logical methods of agreement and difference. Dr. Hirsch is here at his best.

To conclude these illustrations of 'natural' endemics, or of maladies proper to the physical and geological characters of the locality, reference may be made to a very circumscribed but most curious disease, called the Peruvian wart. The warts may be many or few, situated on almost any part of the skin, and sometimes on the mucous surfaces; they lead to bleedings, which are often fatal. The disease was first heard of in connection with the small force under Pizarro in his conquest of Peru, one-fourth of whom are said to have died of hæmorrhage from the warts or the resulting ulceration of the skin. Nothing more was heard of it again in European medical writings until 1842, when it was described as existing in certain valleys of the Andes, especially those of the Cerro Pasco; and further attention was called to it by the heavy mortality which it caused among English engineers and navvies employed upon the so-called Trans-Andean railway in 1874. The valleys, where the wart prevails have all of them the same natural features; they are narrow gorges with rocky sides and a luxuriant vegetation along the stream which traverses them; as soon as the gorge opens out into a wide valley, the endemic influences which produce the disease are no longer felt. It needs only a short residence in such a locality to acquire the warts, and a party of strangers may acquire them almost universally and in a peculiarly fatal form. Of forty English sailors who had left their ships at Callao, and gone to work on the railway, thirty died of the wart in seven or eight months. No white foreigner, it is said, can escape the malady if he remains a few months in one of the 'verruca' valleys. The factors producing it are even more obscure than in the case of goitre. It is the most curious of all the natural endemic diseases, or diseases of locality, and a wonderful revelation of the ways in which the human organism may be affected by its environment of earth, and air, and water.

There are few chapters in Professor Hirsch's three volumes in which we do not find a paragraph relating to that peculiarly modern pastime of hunting for 'disease germs.' It is to Dr. Hirsch's credit that he has kept that kind of pathology within proper limits. The echoes have hardly yet died away of the controversy about the 'cholera-germ.' The claimant which made so bold a bid for that vacant position was a very minute organism, curved like a comma when at rest, and spiral when in motion; and it now appears that it has no better claim to be the true and only 'germ' of cholera than any other of the vibrios

vibrios that have been seen in connection with the disease by many curious seekers for them, during the last thirty or forty years. The British Government went to the expense of sending a Commission to India to enquire into these remarkable allegations. Perhaps the strongest point made by our Commissioners was one that they might very well have advanced while sitting at their writing-tables at home. They pointed out that the cholera-germ, if it were discoverable anywhere, was to be looked for, not in the human body, but in the tainted soil, whence the poisonous emanations rise. Every one who has even an elementary acquaintance with the facts and principles of epidemiology must endorse that opinion. Not only in the Eastern homes of cholera, but even in the countries invaded by it in the West, cholera clings to the soil. The soil, or something secondary and equivalent to it, such as a foul ship or foul bedding or linen, is the breeding-place of the poison. The engendering of the virus is doubtless a kind of fermentation, or putrefaction; and the fermentation, or putrefaction, is carried on in the ground by the agency of living organisms.

A germ-theory of spreading disease existed long before the doctrine of parasitic micro-organisms came into vogue; and if that original theory had been patiently worked out, along the philosophical lines upon which it was started by the great minds of an earlier time, it can hardly be doubted that it would now be in sole possession of the field. But now the microscope is set to find what can only be seen by the vision of concentrated thought. What the microscope has found among the products of specific disease is a considerable variety of minute organisms; and these are somewhat hastily assumed to be the hitherto unidentified reproductive particles of the several infective diseases.

It would be unfair to say, that no thinking went with that new development of the old germ-theory. The truth is, that the problems of disease-species, of their origin and reproduction, are not so simple as many people seem to imagine. Before we come to the germ, we must settle the individual; unless, indeed, we summarily make an end of an old difficulty and decide once for all that the egg does really come before the hen. The medical profession has not only plenty of work before it of the ordinary biological or physiological kind; it has also philosophical problems assigned to it which are, if we mistake not, unique in their difficulty. Should it ever cease to deserve the good name of a liberal and learned profession, it will not be because the subject-matters of its calling do not demand the exercise of the highest qualities.

- ART. IX.—1. *England and Russia face to face in Asia. Travels with the Afghan Boundary Commission.* By Lieutenant A. C. Yate. London, 1887.
2. *Persia and the Persians.* By S. G. W. Benjamin, lately Minister of the United States to Persia. London, 1887.
3. *The Armed Strength of Russia. Prepared in the Intelligence Branch of the War Office.* By Captain J. M. Grierson, R.A. London (published under the superintendence of H.M.'s Stationery Office), 1886.

THE critical position in Bulgaria still concentrates the political attention, not of England only, but of the whole of Europe, on the eternal Eastern Question. The decadence of the Ottoman Empire, and the necessity for providing for the future custody of the Bosphorus, give ever the same general cause for anxiety, though the particular phases of the question vary continually.

Belief in the possibility of maintaining the integrity of the Sultan's dominions, and of securing British interests in the East by a close alliance with the Porte, was long an axiom with English statesmen, and England stood ready to draw the sword at any moment in defence of her joint interests with a valued ally. This unquestioning faith in the necessity and value of the Turkish alliance received a severe shock in the last Russo-Turkish war. Mr. Gladstone's anti-Turkish agitation paved the way for a triumph of his party at the expense of England's faithful ally. Turkey was so crippled and thrown back by the disastrous struggle with Russia, that it is now self-evident that, without extraneous support, her position as an independent Power is endangered; and even if her independence be secured, there can be little hope of any rapid improvement in her disorganized internal condition.

Lord Beaconsfield endeavoured by the Cyprus Convention to restore the feelings of community of interest between England and her old ally, and he bound England, conditionally, to the defence of the Turkish frontier in Asia. The condition was the reform of the Asiatic provincial administration, and the condition has not been fulfilled. The fulfilment has proved impossible, not so much from the disinclination of the Central Government, as from its utter weakness—the result of the blows inflicted in 1878. Meanwhile English statesmen and the English press have continually been taking Turkey to task for the neglect of essential reforms, and threatening to leave her to her fate. These threats and the difficulties of our position in Egypt, *vis-à-vis* the Khedive's suzerain, have resulted

in

in the growing estrangement of the Porte; and the oft-repeated complaints of Turkish misrule, have encouraged in the mind of the British public a belief, that the condition of Turkey is hopeless, and her value as an ally *nil*.

This belief has lately been declaring itself alike in the daily press, in influential weekly and monthly periodicals, and in other publications. The worthlessness of Constantinople as regards British interests is boldly asserted. England, it is said, should withdraw from Continental politics, and let the Eastern Question settle itself. The interests of other Powers, we are told, are more deeply involved than those of Great Britain, and the British nation is advised to let these Powers pull their own chestnuts out of the fire. If we undertake the exposition of the fallacies on which these ideas are based, we are met by still more sweeping assertions, and finally by the argument of fear. New phases in the Eastern Question have, we are assured, changed everything: and, it is added, that even if British interests are affected, we are powerless to protect them. Russia is determined to have her own way; and how is England to stop her? What can England alone do against Russia's enormous forces and reckless obstinacy? Where is a trustworthy ally to be found?

We propose in this article to consider some of the really new phases in the Eastern Question, and how they affect English interests or the chances of English policy. Further, we propose to consider the question of the Russian bugbear, and we shall endeavour to point out the erroneous assumptions on which rest the superstitious fear, unfortunately manifested by some generally valued leaders of public opinion.

Several distinct and important new phases have manifested themselves in the Eastern Question since the date of the Berlin Conference. The greatly increased proximity of the Russian outposts to the frontier of India, the change in the direction of Russian national ambition, making India the goal rather than Constantinople, the increased interest of Austria in the Balkan Peninsula, the growth of the new forces which are arising out of the ruins of the Ottoman dominion in Europe, the assertion of English supremacy in Egypt, and the collapse of Greek aspirations, all these are new and important factors in this complicated question.

We have already said, that the main consideration in the Eastern Question is the custody of Constantinople, involving the command of the water-way between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. 'The Russians shall not have Constantinople,' has long been the resounding key-note of England's policy in Eastern

Eastern Europe. We are now told that the conditions under which this policy was formed are gone, whilst the policy still guides us. The conditions referred to, appear to be the desirability of maintaining the position of England as one of the Great Powers, and of preserving the balance of power in Europe. But in the first place, although the discussion of this proposition is not the object of the present article, we are by no means prepared to admit that it is correct; and secondly, even if it be true that the balance of power in Europe, and England's position with regard to it, are no longer matters of importance to British interests, this would not at all dispose of the question of England's interest in keeping Russia out of Constantinople. Checking the process of Russian aggrandizement which is being carried on at the expense of Turkey in particular, and of the balance of power in Europe generally, we may admit to be of secondary interest; but we are prepared to prove, that keeping the Russians out of Constantinople is a matter of primary importance for the maintenance of our supremacy in India, and for our commercial interests, especially for keeping open the markets in the East—in Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan—which Russia would close to us.

Among the new phases of the Eastern Question we have classed as the most important to British interests, the extraordinarily increased proximity of the Russian outposts to the Indian frontier, and the change in public feeling in Russia, which now looks more covetously towards India than towards Constantinople. It is to be hoped that the days are gone by, when any educated observer of passing events would dare to say that the rapid progress of Russia in Asia is not a menace to our Indian Empire. To those who would fain believe that this rapid advance is the result of accidental circumstances, we would, with full knowledge of the subject, reply, by challenging any high official, either Liberal, or Conservative, in either India, or England, to say that he had not had absolute proofs before him that the Russian advance is the result of a well-matured design to dispute our Empire in the East.

And although we thus appeal confidently to the judgment of English statesmen, based on irresistible evidence submitted to them in their official capacity, we are not confined to this class of proof alone. For those who really seek information, there is plenty of evidence to be acquired outside the Government offices. Let any constant reader of Russian journals say, whether that portion of the Russian Press which finds most favour with the public and with the Government is not constantly harping on the theme of India, and threatening to attack
England

England in the East. Let Englishmen who have been long resident in Russia, and, speaking Russian, have mixed intimately in Russian circles, say, whether the advance on India is not a frequent and engrossing subject of conversation. Why is Russia troubling herself to organize the forces of Persia, lending her officers, and making presents of artillery to the Shah? The services of Persia are certainly not required either in Europe or in Central Asia. They are required to secure the flank of the Russian advance on India. We have heard a Russian say, 'Ah! you English have always had the best of us till now, but it was your gold that beat us, and now we know where the gold comes from, we shall seize the mine. We will take India. Then we shall have the money and you will cease to exist.' When the popular and accomplished Russian painter Vereshchagin, exhibited in St. Petersburg his wonderful gallery of Indian pictures, the largest and most conspicuous painting showed the procession of the great Durbar at Delhi, headed by the Prince of Wales. This picture drew down on Vereshchagin the wrath of the patriotic press. The Russian painter was roundly accused of want of patriotism in making the representative of English rule the leading figure in his masterpiece. But it will be said, these are the exaggerated ideas of fanatics. We reply, that the Russian nation is becoming fanatical on the subject of India, and fanatics are people against whom every conceivable precaution must be taken.

These views are perfectly confirmed by the conclusions of Mr. Benjamin, whose recently published work, entitled 'Persia and the Persians,' gives much valuable information about the country, where he resided some time as the representative of the United States. As a disinterested observer of the struggle between Russia and England, and as a favoured diplomatist at the Persian capital, he had special opportunities for noting the course of events. In his concluding chapter, on the political situation in Persia, Mr. Benjamin speaks pretty freely; and his remarks on the subject must, from his independent position, have such weight, that we cannot refrain from quoting him at some considerable length. He says:—

'The definite purpose of Russia sooner or later to push her conquests southward until she reaches the Indian Ocean, either at Bombay or Bushire, cannot now be doubted. The secrecy of her tactics in those quarters shows the same far-sighted determination to accomplish a vast and deep-laid scheme, that she has displayed in Europe for a century. None but the most unsophisticated, or those gifted with phenomenal credulity, can for a moment accept any other solution of the conduct of Russia.

'I had

'I had precise information of her advance to Panj-dêh or the Ford of Five Bridges, and to other points farther south, before the facts were first rumoured in Europe, where they were persistently denied by the courts and press of both England and Russia, and then finally confirmed. To move thus in secret, to pave the way with promises and gold, to bluster and prevaricate when discovered, but in any case to move steadily ahead, and not to recede an inch until her battalions halt on the shores of the Southern Sea—this is the policy and the determination of Russia. Said a Russian gentleman to a member of the United States Legation: "Believe nothing you hear *à propos* of the imbroglio on the Eastern frontier. Even if you hear any one swear that we do not want Herat, do not believe him; not even if I swear, not even if the Tsar should swear, do not believe it. We want Herat and we shall have it!"

'Looked at in the abstract, Russia has quite as much right to advance on India as England had to take it. It is not Russia's advance, if she can do so, which is in question here, but her dark methods, her treachery, her dissimulation, and deceit. Furthermore, the world may also hesitate with reason to see her accumulate any more territory; she has already more than has been held by any power since the foundation of the globe. So far as India is concerned, she is certain to be under the sway either of England or Russia for ages to come; and wherein will she be benefited by a change of rulers, just as she is beginning to feel the advantages of the beneficent sway of England? It is nonsense to assume that any Asiatic people could be improved by exchanging the rod of England for that of Russia. Yet if Great Britain would maintain her hold in the East, she must be at once more wary and firm; success with Orientals is absolutely dependent on both. The emissaries of Russia are even now swarming in the north of India—not Russians, but Asiatics in Russian pay, who are familiarizing the people with grandiose ideas of the overpowering growth, the magnitude, the wealth, and the generosity of Russia.

On the same subject Lieutenant Yate, whose service on the late Afghan Boundary Commission gave him special opportunities for noting the designs and methods of the Russians in Central Asia, says:—

'I am personally quite convinced that the Russian Government will overstep the demarcated frontier at the first opportunity. Every care has been taken by the British Commission, by conceding to Russia the heads of water-supply, and indeed making any reasonable concessions, to avoid disputes hereafter. But to leave no loophole for a watchful foe ever on the *qui vive* to seize any opening, is obviously impossible. Disputes must arise, and the nature of their settlement will mainly depend on the policy of the British Government. If the weak spirit of concession that has been evinced for the past two years is adhered to, then of course Russia will have its own way, and little by little filch from the Amir the little territory that

is

is still left to him north of the Hindu Kush. It is indeed strange that the Government of England, the power of which in Southern Asia is firmly established, should find itself unable to present a resolute front to the unstable and precarious position held by Russia in Central Asia. Yet so it is. Indeed from past events the world and the nationalities of Central Asia must conclude that Russia has the stronger position of the two in Asia. And yet such is not the case. It is most clearly a false policy to send a Commission to the north of Afghanistan for the purpose of conceding Afghan territory to Russia. . . . It were almost better for us to have left to Russia the *onus* of robbing Afghanistan of its territory, than to take upon ourselves the *onus* of conceding it to Russia.'

The universal belief, even among educated Russians, in the marvellous riches of India, is almost incredible to those who have not actually heard it expressed. And while this belief exists, and influences large classes who have no direct interest in the matter, let it be noted that circumstances have been continually increasing the number of Russians who see a direct advantage to themselves in the advance on India. Where a nation is suffering from extreme poverty, Eldorados are readily believed in, and covetousness influences national sentiment; but where, besides a national hallucination, the material interests of numbers of the most influential classes are really involved, action will surely follow sentiment.

The growth of the practical interests, which have directed Russia's attention so strongly towards India, has been hitherto almost unnoticed. Yet their influence is very great and is easily to be understood. Under the most rigorous protection Russian manufactures, particularly in textile fabrics, have enormously developed during the last fifteen or twenty years. The inflation of the paper currency, and the fictitious prosperity, which followed the last Turkish war, gave an extra impetus to the manufacturing interest. The natural reaction followed, and Russia, like her neighbours, has been suffering acutely for the last few years, from over-production of nearly every article she manufactures. Under these circumstances the cry of the commercial classes is, as elsewhere, for new markets, and Asia generally, and India particularly, offer promising fields where Russia may hope to expand her trade, secure from the competition of more civilized rivals. The amount of Russian trade with Central Asia, according to our estimates in such matters, is very small. But the whole trade of Russia is under similar comparisons exceedingly small. The Asiatic branch is, however, a fairly important percentage of that limited whole, and therefore its importance to Russian commerce is out of all proportion to

to what the amount would at first lead us to suppose. Where Russia goes, she establishes her protective tariff,—a tariff at once the most rigid and exclusive,—and England and other rivals are driven out of the field. If therefore the comparatively small Central Asian market is of importance to the Russian manufacturer, it is easy to perceive, that the possession of the Indian market represents to him an endless source of wealth. Riches and prosperity would, he thinks, be readily attained, if only the English were driven out of India, the protective tariff established, and the supply of the swarming millions of natives given to Russian trade.

This is an intelligible and direct interest, which acts on the best class in the Russian Empire, and the one which, when honestly consulted, was the strongest opponent of all such rash ventures as the last Turkish war. But besides the interests of the mercantile class, the Government are ever urged on towards India by the ambition of the entire body of officials in Asia, civil and military, and of all those connected with them. Experience has shown that, whilst a successful campaign in Europe means only a certain number of decorations, with fewer promotions and small pensions, the results of each fresh advance in Asia are much more solid to those engaged. Each advance, followed by a permanent acquisition of territory, means not only a distribution of decorations, promotions and pensions, but, with far less hardship and risk of life and limb than accompany a European campaign, it secures for those concerned a number of permanent and lucrative posts, both civil and military. When a new province is organized, a large number of desirable appointments is necessarily given in the administration created, and these are solid prizes to be gained by individuals, and for which no equivalent would be obtained by a European war. The Russian trader cannot live in competition with the more advanced communities beyond his frontier in Europe; and whilst Germans and Poles crowd into Russia, and thrive on the necessities of the Russian, the latter even with every advantage given him, as in Bulgaria, cannot make a livelihood in countries more civilized than his own. Similarly the national superiority of the Bulgarians was always an obstacle to the Russian would-be military and civil administrators of Bulgaria, and the final result, as we have all seen, has been the complete expulsion of the intruders.

Independent of all material interests, however, there existed up to the date of the last Turkish war, a strong feeling of national animosity against the Turk and of sympathy with the Slavs under his yoke. Those who know Russia well can explain

explain that these sentiments are now practically dead. The hatred of the Turk was a relic of the days when Russia herself suffered so much from the Tatars, and when she looked upon all Mohammedans as her natural enemies. The visible decay of the Turkish power, the practical emancipation of all the formerly subject Slav nationalities, and the evidence of the Russian armies which fought in Bulgaria, and saw for themselves that the condition of the persecuted Bulgarians was superior to their own, have now, however, combined to extinguish sentiments which owed their origin to a totally different condition of affairs. Ambitious Russian politicians may still cherish the idea of a Pan-Slavonic federation, force of habit may for a time continue to draw subscriptions to Slavophil societies, and agitators struggling to live on the fitful flickerings of an expiring sentiment, may yet noisily advertise themselves, but it may be taken for granted that no real popular enthusiasm can ever again be aroused on the subject. The Russian peasant now knows that his faith is in no danger from the Turks, and that his so-called brothers are better off than himself; and he will not again readily endure the sufferings and privations which accompanied his latest and unnecessary efforts on their behalf.

The peasant is not yet seized with the fever of the Indian idea, but the infection will reach him in time, for already to-day the leading eyes of the nation are looking to the south-east, and no longer to the south-west. Russian statesmen inaugurated the policy of aggressive advance towards India to check England's interference in favour of the Ottoman Empire. A small school, still dreaming of securing an absolute Russian preponderance in Europe, may yet look on the Asiatic advance as subsidiary to larger aims in the West; but their dream is vanishing before the irresistible force of circumstances. Had Russian policy to-day been the same as it was ten years ago, the recent fiasco in Bulgaria would certainly and immediately have been followed by a European war. But even in Russia public opinion begins to grow, and consequently the more serious provocation to a breach of the peace is caused by a sentiment, strongly felt in high quarters, of wounded national dignity, rather than by really deep national interest in the question at issue. It is impossible to dispose of old associations at a moment's notice, and Russian interest in the Balkan Peninsula cannot be extinguished in a day. But it has become a secondary interest, and the sooner this important fact is recognized by English statesmen, the better.

It must not be supposed that we would argue that Russian

concern in the question of the occupancy of Constantinople is diminishing. On this particular point Russia is as interested as ever. We only maintain, that the extension of her direct Empire to the Sea of Marmora and the Mediterranean is no longer a primary object of serious policy, and that even the establishment of her sovereignty or suzerainty at Constantinople, is no longer viewed as an end in itself, but only as the means to an end. And that end is the possession of India.

In a very recent article in the semi-official organ of the Russian Foreign Office, the 'Nord,' we read, 'Russia does not want Constantinople. If Turkey can be trusted as a faithful ally, she can remain the custodian.' A writer in the English press quoted this statement as an instance of Russian hypocrisy. But it is the truth. Or, if not the whole truth, it at least indicates correctly the leading feature of the new Russian policy. Constantinople must be occupied by either Russia herself, or by some thoroughly trustworthy ally, who may be relied upon to keep the English out of the Black Sea. That is what is required, and it is required because Russian statesmen realize, that it is essential for the success of their designs on India, that England shall not have access to the shores of the Black Sea. It remains for us to consider why the command of the Bosphorus is recognized as so directly influencing the chances of Russian success in the eager advance against India, and what steps England should take in this quarter to meet and counteract the designs of her persistent foe.

It seems to be assumed by those English writers who would disparage the strategical value of the position of Constantinople, that it is only in connection with the subject of our communications to India that the closing or opening of the Black Sea to vessels of war can be a matter of importance to us. We cannot accept this assumption as the only basis for our consideration of the value of Constantinople; and we note that, when this line of argument is advanced, it is generally limited to a discussion of the possibility of interference with our route to India by the Suez Canal. We are assured that military experts place but little value on the Canal as a line of communication in time of war, and that the real route to India is round the Cape of Good Hope. This appears to us far too light and summary a disposal of an important subject. Without going too deeply into a question, which is somewhat beside our particular argument, we would point out, that the Canal is not the only means of transit across the Isthmus of Suez, and that were the Canal temporarily obstructed, troops could, as in the old days, be rapidly pushed forward by the Alexandria-Suez Railway.

Railway. Further, we would observe that Karachi is the port to which we must direct our troops and stores to meet a Russian attack on India, and Karachi can be reached from England fourteen days sooner by the Canal than by the Cape route.

Portsmouth to Karachi through the Suez Canal is twenty-three days' voyage; and round the Cape at a similar speed of steaming it takes thirty-seven days. This, it must be allowed, is far too important a difference to allow of the assumption, that the Cape route can at all compete for celerity and convenience with that through the Canal. To reach the Bay of Bengal the question is somewhat different, though even there we find that, *via* the Canal, Calcutta is reached in twenty-eight days, as against forty days round the Cape of Good Hope. But it is hardly necessary to point out that troops proceeding to the north-west frontier of India would not be landed in the Bay of Bengal.

It is no doubt most valuable to have alternative routes to the Suez Canal. We entirely agree as to the value in this respect of the Cape line of communication, and as to the importance of completing the defensive works at Simon's Bay and the Mauritius; and we are thoroughly alive to the advantages of the newly-opened route across British America and the Pacific, of which we have spoken fully in our article on 'the Canadian Pacific Railway' in the present number of the 'Review.' But we must not lose sight of the utility of Egyptian railways, or of the possible opening up of a still more direct route through Syria to the Persian Gulf, and we consider it indisputable that a Russian occupation of Constantinople would endanger the security of all routes traversing the Eastern Mediterranean.

As we have already intimated, the question of our communications with India is not, however, in our opinion the most important in connection with the occupancy of Constantinople. We assume, and trust that we have shown good grounds for our assumption, that Russia is bent on attacking us in India. When that attack is delivered, how are we to meet it? On the Indian frontier we must stand on the defensive. Any serious advance into Central Asia would be an act of folly which we may trust that our generals will not commit. But to fight on the defensive only is to give half the advantage of battle to our adversary, and particularly in this case, where a defensive inland warfare would deprive us of any direct advantage from our supremacy at sea. The result of our operations in the Baltic during the Crimean war was not such as to encourage us to hope for any decisive results from efforts in that quarter. The Finns are most averse

to being dragged into wars to gratify Russian ambition, and operations on the Finnish coast would be most unadvisable, as tending to heal a sore between Russia and a subject nationality, which, under certain circumstances, might become very troublesome. Cronstadt is a hard nut to crack, though perhaps not so impregnable as is generally assumed. There remain of any importance on the Baltic shores, Revel, Riga and Libau. No doubt these ports should and would be blockaded, but what decisive advantage are we to gain even by bombarding and destroying them? The bombardment of Odessa would be equally useless, and another invasion of the Crimea would be a repetition of an acknowledged blunder, though it ought to be borne in mind that the struggle cost Russia half a million of men, burdened her with an enormous debt, and paralyzed her energies for many years. How then is England to take the first steps towards shaking the power of the Colossus? Where is she to take the offensive? Where are the mortal blows to be struck which alone can secure real and lasting advantages in the death struggle which will surely be forced upon us?

Russian strategists know full well that these blows can only be struck from the south-eastern shores of the Black Sea. Armenia and the Trans-Caucasus must be the scene of any effective offensive operations, and if the Bosphorus is closed against us, where are we to disembark our troops? How are we to reach the most vulnerable point in the Russian armour? Crooked as the policy of the Porte may be at times, the chance of recovering the lost provinces in Asia Minor must, as long as the Ottoman Empire hopes to maintain its independence, secure to us the co-operation of the Sultan's soldiers, in any serious attack on Russia's Trans-Caucasian dominion. The political, strategical, and tactical advantages of this line of attack are so great, that when once considered, its desirability ceases to be a matter of question.

In the Black Sea full advantage will be drawn from the superiority of our naval forces. No closing of ports and channels by ice will interfere with the movements of the fleet. An extended coast line can be threatened successively at so many important points, that a very large force will be required for its protection. Russia's most valuable, and indeed her only line of communication with the Trans-Caucasus, which is unaffected by winter severities, lies across the Black Sea. The presence of the British fleet will deprive her of its use. Winter ice and snows, her most trusty allies elsewhere, the vanquishers of Napoleon and the Grande Armée, will prove Russia's worst foes in a struggle

struggle in the Trans-Caucasus. They will completely cut her best communications, and seriously obstruct those which they do not absolutely sever.

It is to be observed, also, that the occupation of the Black Sea relieves Turkey from all apprehension of attack except on the Armenian frontier. In the present and probably permanent disposition of Roumanians, Servians, Bulgarians, and Austrians, another invasion of the Balkan Peninsula from the north would be a foolhardy enterprise. Without the means of landing in the Balkan Peninsula, Russia is precluded from any direct attempt on Constantinople, and this feeling of security at the capital would greatly encourage the Porte. Russia would be obliged to meet her foes on the fields which for numerous reasons they would themselves specially select.

Again, Russia, as we have said, is drilling Persian soldiers to assist in her advance on India. But Persia is an unwilling ally. The first successes gained by Anglo-Turkish forces on her borders would make her think of her own security and advantages, and the Russian-drilled horsemen would soon be found turning on their instructors, and attacking the long and exposed line of Russian communications between the Caspian and Herat. A supine policy, which wilfully ignored the dangers of the Russian advance, has abandoned Persia to the mercies of the Tsar. Persia is no longer an independent power, but dared she strike for freedom and boldly attack the Russian communications which follow through the desert, the line of her frontier, a Russian advance on India by Herat becomes simply impossible. No military strategist can dispute the fact, that, if the invasion of India by Herat is undertaken, the Russian armies on the Indian frontier will be doomed to annihilation, from the moment that the Persians cut their communications. Such an operation would not require any very large or highly organized force, and it is well within the power of the Persia of to-day to undertake it, if she dared. She will dare, and rejoice in the opportunity, when she is guaranteed from attack on her other flank, from the shores of the Caspian and the valley of the Araxes. And the necessary guarantee will be found when an Anglo-Turkish army is holding its own in the Trans-Caucasus.

Both on the importance of attacking the Russian Trans-Caspian communications, and on the power of the Persians to render effective service in this operation, Mr. Benjamin writes very strongly. As to the necessity of the Russian advance on India being met by a counter-attack, he says,—

‘ If,

'If, however, England proposes to hold India she must be prepared for bold strategy. She can be sure that unless she attacks the Russians in the rear, by harassing their long line of march or their stealthy railway, Russia herself will employ this manœuvre against England, by causing a flank insurrection in India while the British forces are occupied defending the passes.'

As regards the capabilities of Persian troops, Mr. Benjamin observes, that in her last two wars with Persia, Russia invaded that country with armies of 30,000 to 50,000 men, that she obtained decisive successes only after several campaigns and much hard fighting, and that the Persians repeatedly routed Russian armies in the open field, and heroically withstood several severe sieges. This was done with poorly armed and paid troops;

'but now,' he says, 'in case of a war with Russia, if the Persian army were provided with experienced English or German officers, there is no question that it could be depended on to make a good report. The army is at present nominally fixed at 50,000 men, but actually represents about 30,000. It might however be raised, in case of an emergency, to 200,000.'

Mr. Yate apparently estimates the Persian forces at some 40,000 efficient men, of whom 24,500 are said to be present with the colours. These numbers do not include 12,000 irregular cavalry, which Mr. Yate considers could render most valuable service in creating diversions along the lengthy line of the Russian communications.

We have thus briefly sketched the strategical advantages of directing an attack on Russia from the shores of the Black Sea. They are so intimately connected with the political advantages, that it is difficult to separate the one from the other. No European Power is likely to be sufficiently interested to appear as our ally in repelling an invasion of India, and therefore it becomes all important to take the best means of securing the co-operation of Turkey and Persia. It is clear that it is only near their own borders that we could obtain their assistance, but east of the Black Sea both can render invaluable services. Turkey can find the men to give numerical strength in our first attack, and Persia, though weak, can give the *coup de grâce* in Central Asia when once the enemy is brought to bay elsewhere. Again, by attacking Russia in the Trans-Caucasus we put her at the disadvantage of fighting in one of the portions of her territory where the inhabitants are bitterly hostile to her rule. The Mohammedan tribes of the Caucasus have been subdued, but they are not reconciled to their fate, and even when there
can

can be no prospect or hope of success, their wild spirit continually tempts them to fruitless outbreaks. During the last Turkish war the Lazis, the Abkhasians, and the tribes of Daghestan, all rose and struck for freedom; and during the last few weeks, at a time when there could be no external encouragement, there have been serious disturbances in the east-central section of the Caucasian range.

Attacks on Russian territory elsewhere would have no definite lasting result, whilst success in the Trans-Caucasus should throw Russia permanently back, to the northern side of the natural frontier formed by the Caucasian mountains. If Russia were driven out of Finland, the Baltic provinces, or the Crimea, as the result of unsuccessful war, there would be nothing to prevent her, after a few years' interval, tearing up her treaties and re-occupying her old territory. But it took a century to subdue the tribes of the Caucasus, and if the Russians were again driven to the northern side of the mountains, the physical configuration of the country would render it easy to keep them within the boundaries which would be assigned to them. The occupation of the Trans-Caucasus, and the command of the Caspian by a friendly power, would restore the independence of Persia, and free her from the pressure of the Tsar's heavy hand. This, as already pointed out, must destroy the military value of the important line of communications which Russia has established at such enormous cost between Herat and the shores of the Caspian, and no result of war could be more decisive. When the safety of her military route to India is compromised, Russia must relinquish her ambitious projects of conquest at the expense of our Indian Empire. No greater boon could be conferred upon India and her people, than a relief from the constant dread of invasion, which at present doubles their taxes and cripples their energies.

Before quitting this part of the subject, there are two minor, though not unimportant, points, which must be noted in connection with the advantage of operations in the Trans-Caucasus. The first of these is the moral effect in our favour which would be secured even by the first success. A brilliant success in the Baltic would hardly be known in Asia. But Russia has so long appeared as absolute master in the regions where we would attack her, that the news of a successful landing of British troops in the Caucasus would rapidly spread, and would produce an extraordinary moral effect throughout Central Asia. With Asiatics moral effect is even more important than with Europeans, and our task would be greatly lightened when we had secured in our favour this first and valuable element of success.

The

The remaining consideration, to which we would draw attention, is the special tactical advantage offered by the mountainous nature of the regions bordering on the south-eastern shores of the Black Sea. In such difficult mountainous country the overwhelming preponderance of cavalry which Russia could bring into the field would not avail her. The Turks have no horsemen fit to cope in the plains with the swarms of cavalry included in the Tsar's armies; but Turkish foot-soldiers, with a nucleus of English troops, would well hold their own among the hills against the best Russian infantry, and a small force of English light cavalry, supplemented by such Kurdish horsemen as were successfully led by Ismail Pasha in 1878, could perform all duties which would be required of them under the special conditions.

We hope that we have now said enough to establish our contention,—that it is necessary for the preservation of our Indian Empire to secure the possibility of effectually taking the offensive against Russia;—that the Trans-Caucasus offers the vantage-ground where such an attack could be made with the greatest chance of success, and where alone the results of success would be great and lasting;—that the free access of our fleet to the Black Sea is an essential condition of the possibility of delivering this most effective attack;—and that an alliance with the Turks and the co-operation of their hardy soldiers are equally necessary to the same end. We may assume it to be self-evident, that access to the Black Sea is dependent on the goodwill of the custodians of Constantinople, and therefore it must be accepted that the maintenance of the Turks at Constantinople, and the preservation of their Empire in Asia Minor, are objects of vital importance to the best recognized British interests.

We pass now to the argument of fear, and we trust to be able to show, that England has no cause to dread the result of a struggle with Russia, undertaken with prudence, and under the proper conditions.

The argument of fear appears to be chiefly based on the numerical superiority of the Russian over the English army. It is not asserted that the Russian soldier is a better man or better equipped than the English soldier, neither does it appear to be supposed that the organization or generalship of the Russian army is better than our own. Without therefore going into technical details to prove the faultiness of Russian organization or equipment, we may assume, that in these respects there is no advantage against us; and as regards Russian generalship, we would only remind our readers of the pitiable exhibition witnessed in Bulgaria in 1878, and of the circumstance

circumstance that Skoboleff and Todleben, the only really distinguished Russian leaders, are now no more. We have therefore to deal chiefly with the question of numerical superiority. Now, according to a most valuable work, 'The Armed Strength of Russia,' which has just been published by the Intelligence Branch of our War Office, the Russian nominal peace establishment is approximately 800,000 men, and the war establishment is 2,300,000 men, of whom some 1,300,000 are combatant infantry. It has been already pointed out that tactical considerations deprive Russia in the Caucasus of all advantage from her numerical superiority in the cavalry arm. Against the Russian infantry we should probably be able to place in line 60,000 good British troops, and with Turkish regulars the number of men might easily be made up to 200,000, while a reserve of, say, 100,000 men should also be available. These figures can be vouched for as practical, and though they show a very respectable force, it must be admitted that an army of 300,000 Turks and Englishmen would not have much chance against the Tsar's hordes of men, if the latter could be concentrated and provisioned so as to undertake direct operations against them. The veriest tyro in military matters must, however, realize that numbers go for nothing, unless they can be concentrated and maintained in face of the enemy. But this is exactly what cannot be done with the Tsar's armies, and without entering into minute technicalities on the subject, we think that, by a few general observations, this fact can be made perfectly clear, even to our non-military readers.

In the first place, to make any serious attack on our Indian frontier when the English railway communications with the valley of the Indus and other preparations are complete, would require the disposal of a minimum force of 100,000 men for active operations at that front. From Candahar to the Caspian is some 1170 miles, and the entire route being at the mercy of Afghans and Turcomans, who under no circumstances are likely to have any real love for the Russians, the watching of this long line of communication would, with necessary reserves, absorb another 100,000 men. Further, it is not to be supposed that the Khivans, Bokhariots, and other recently subdued nationalities in Central Asia would look unmoved on a death struggle between their Russian masters and the 'Ingiliz,' the renowned successors of the great dynasties of Hindostan. More or less agitation would certainly prevail in Central Asia, as long as the issue of the fight was undecided, and, if Russia were beaten, her Asiatic subjects would turn on her with lightning rapidity. It is safe to assume that, to meet this special danger, it would
be

be necessary to double all the garrisons in Central Asia. Nor would this end the special calls for men. The long coast-line forming the shores of the Baltic and the Black Sea, being exposed to the operations of the British fleet, armies of observation would be required, both in the north and in the south, to protect the maritime provinces. Finally, in the present and probably lasting condition of politics in Eastern Europe, England, when allied with Turkey against Russia, may count on at least the benevolent neutrality of Austria and the sympathies of Roumania and the Balkan States. And this means, that Russia would not dare to move a man of the 380,000 (without counting the due proportion of reserves) habitually garrisoned in Poland and her western provinces.

It is then evident, that even as regards the numbers of her forces, the enormous superiority of Russia melts away under careful consideration. But it must also be remembered, that the concentration of men without the means of providing them with food, ammunition, and the varied necessities of modern warfare, is merely slaying your own soldiers; and we can show that, in the question of supply, an enormous advantage rests with England.

On our Indian frontier, with the new system of railways to connect our maritime base at Karachi, with our scientific frontier in the North-West, and with our magazines established well up to the front, we should have no difficulty in supplying any number of men whom we might find it necessary to put in line. The Russians, until they have occupied and held Herat for some time, can have no important magazine nearer than Askabad, distant about 800 miles. Mr. Yate, who had every opportunity of studying the country, says that, 'To render Herat a really valuable base, whence an advance can be made on India, it must be carefully administered by Russia for a good many years.' He estimates that the Herat Valley could not, in its present condition, support more than 20,000 to 30,000 men, even with the assistance of supplies brought forward by the Trans-Caspian Railway. From Askabad to the Caspian there is at present only a single line of railway, and beyond the Caspian the Russians are dependent on the shallow navigation of the Lower Volga, obstructed by the difficulties of the bar below Astrachan.

These facts show the superiority of our communications with the scene of action on the Indian frontier; and with respect to the Armenian battle-field we have an equal advantage. The command of the Black Sea will certainly give an English expedition the advantage of a base on the sea within reason-
able

able distance of the front, while the Russians will again be dependent on the navigation of the Volga and its obstructed mouth, and on the roadways crossing the difficult passes of the Caucasian range. In winter the Volga is for months closed by ice, and that line must be abandoned, and at the same period the mountain passes become so blocked by snow, that they are always difficult and often absolutely impassable for a couple of weeks at a time. We must add, that the Trans-Caucasus now frequently imports grain for the consumption of its ordinary population; and remembering that besides food, every cartridge, every shell, and every article of equipment required, must be delivered by the inadequate lines of communication described above, we think it will be seen, that it is a physical impossibility for Russia to maintain supplies for imposing forces south of the Caucasus range.

So far we have merely dealt theoretically with details of numbers and possibilities of supply in an imaginary case; but we are able to confirm the deductions from our theoretical speculations by a reference to the results of positive experience. The resources of Russia have not materially increased since the last Russo-Turkish war; and it is important to notice, that during that struggle, when, after her reverses before Plevna, Russia was straining every nerve for the mastery, she was at no time able (out of her nominal millions) to maintain in the field more than 550,000 men, divided between her two armies, in Asia Minor and in the Balkan Peninsula. And this comparatively poor result was obtained by putting a still well-remembered strain on the peasantry, and by giving commissions as officers to boys of sixteen from the cadet schools. The terrible privations and sickness of the Russian soldiers in Turkey are still fresh in our memory, and we know, that the want of proper supplies was a main cause of their sufferings. Yet during this war the Russian communications through the Balkan Peninsula were perfectly secure and uninterrupted, and food supplies could be drawn in abundance from the neighbouring countries. Surely when we know that Russia was thus strained to meet Turkey alone, we may feel some confidence, that she would find it a difficult matter to contend with the resources of England and Turkey combined, and particularly when the theatre of war was selected by her adversaries, as that which would be most disadvantageous to her.

Having thus discussed the chief military and political considerations, which would affect the issue of a war against Russia, undertaken by an Anglo-Turkish alliance, we may now consider how far the internal condition of that country might influence

influence the question before us. And here we must note, that a war between England and Russia would not be fought under the conditions of ordinary modern European warfare. If England conducts the struggle prudently, there will be no great battles, fought in a first and single campaign and decisive of the great issues at stake. Prince Bismarck is reported to have said, that a war between England and Russia was as absurd as the idea of a fight between a bear and a whale. But time will work miracles, and in this instance it will be seen, that time will work the miracle of enabling the whale to meet and crush the bear. Lord Beaconsfield, in one of his great speeches on the subject, emphatically declared that a war with Russia did not mean a war of one or even two campaigns, for England was in a position to continue the struggle indefinitely. Never could a keener appreciation of the subject be shown than in this declaration. England is in a condition to prolong the struggle indefinitely. Russia is not. Russian resources must give way under a prolonged strain, and Russian administrative corruption and internal discontent will fight hard for England, if they have time to make themselves felt. The greatest danger to England is lest her generals, too sensitive to a probable national impatience for results, should be tempted to fight in order to make newspaper headings. Time will be England's best friend, time to collect her resources and organize her Turkish allies, and time to let Russia collapse from internal weakness. The occupation of St. Petersburg and Moscow, after a three months' campaign, would not injure Russia to nearly the same extent as three years' apparently indecisive fighting in Afghanistan and Armenia. She would recover from the former much quicker than from the latter. In the former case there would be no time for the strain to come on the mass of the people; in the latter, the masses would have begun to feel the pressure acutely, and sooner or later they would resent their sufferings.

The condition of the Russian peasantry, which has been long and steadily deteriorating, has now become so utterly hopeless, that only some special extra pressure is required to make their deep discontent break out in rebellion. The 'moujik' knows nothing of 'Constitutions' or 'political freedom.' He sighs for none of these things. He hates the Nihilists, for they are innovators and the declared enemies of the Tsar. He has a great patriotic and superstitious regard for the Emperor, as the head of his Church, the fountain of all good gifts, and the representative of an ancient national institution. But when firmly established in his position, one Tsar satisfies

the

the Russian peasant quite as well as another. The Emperor Nicholas was quite as good to him as would have been his elder brother Constantine, had the latter not been put out of the way; and the Empress Catherine, a foreigner and a woman, was quite as good as the husband whom she disposed of. If his grievances become too great, the peasant will not hesitate to attack the Tsar's officers, tax-collectors, and others, and he will maintain a comfortable theory, that the Autocrat is unaware of his sufferings, and that he is the victim of wicked nobles and officials who have combined to persecute him and to deceive the Tsar.

Before the peasant was emancipated, he worked under his master's directions, he paid no taxes, he seldom had any money, and he got but little 'vodky.' His master guaranteed his subsistence, and he had no particular cares or anxieties. When emancipated, he was made a present of some land, but he also became responsible for his own subsistence, and he became subject to a land-tax. He remained, however, thoroughly careless, and his only solicitude was to do as little work as possible. Circumstances for a time favoured him. Good land was abundant, the price of corn in Europe rose, railways were made to transport his grain, the money rolled pleasantly into his pockets, and the Government kindly abolished the spirit monopolies, and brought 'vodky' plentiful and cheap to his door. Times have, however, changed now; his land, which he never troubled to manure, is exhausted; the price of grain has fallen; America and India are competing with him; his sons, his labourers, are taken away by the conscription, and the land-tax alone remains as before. Remissions of the tax are made from time to time, but only where the arrears have become so heavy that their collection is perfectly hopeless. Naturally the peasant is on his last legs, and anything but cheerful. He is slow to move, but with a little extra pressure, a cry against any of his recognized enemies, the Jews, the 'tchinovniks,'* or the nobles, will start him on a career of violence, which nothing but grape-shot will stop. And this is the great danger which will assail Russia from within, under the influence of the stress of a prolonged war.

The Nihilist propaganda, and the discontent of the various non-Russian races and nationalities, subjects of the Tsar in European Russia, are the other chief internal dangers which threaten the Empire. As regards the former, although revolutionary principles are steadily growing, we think that at present, and for some little time to come, Nihilism is impotent to over-

* 'Tchinovnik'—petty Government official.

throw the Autocracy. As we have already said, it has no hold on the peasantry, and it naturally does not find converts among the enormous class of officials, whose daily bread depends on the maintenance of the present *régime*, and who are fairly satisfied with their lot. The badly-paid, minor tchinovniks may join the Nihilists, but they were at all times the most despised class in the community, and have absolutely no power or influence to cause them to be seriously feared. Nihilist conspiracies may at any moment remove the Tsar or any of his officials, and in times of disturbance from other causes, such blows would have their influence, but by themselves they would have no effect. Alexander II. was succeeded by his son as naturally and quietly as if he had died of old age, and the Nihilist movement in Russia gained no ground by the success of its desperate enterprise.

As regards the heterogeneous collection of 'nationalities' forming an important proportion of the population of European Russia, we have in a former article, on 'the Races of European Russia,'* dealt fully with this subject. Here it will suffice to remind our readers, that the Tsar has some fifteen millions of more or less discontented, non-Russian, subjects in Europe alone. Of these the most important and numerous section are the Poles, but from the nature of the case it would be quite impossible for England at the outset of a campaign to promote or assist a rising in Poland. The Poles have had some severe lessons in insurrections. They are quite ready to fall on Russia when they see a chance, but that chance they will only believe to exist when a foreign army is occupying their country, and has already defeated the Russians in the field. Russia's internal enemies, the races unwillingly subject to her rule, Finns, Poles, Germans, Jews, Lithuanians, and numerous others, form a deep fringe round her European frontiers. But these races are scattered, have no common faith or language, no rallying-point, and no organization. The power of Imperial Russia is organized and concentrated, and her bondsmen must bear their yoke until she has been humbled by a foreign foe. The long-deferred day of reckoning between them will, however, surely come, and great will be the surprise of those who speak of Russia as a solid compact Power, when, on the first sign of her defeat, her numerous enemies among her own subjects will display their deep-rooted hatred of her rule.

Russian administrative corruption has long been a by-word, and the hopeless condition of her finances is well understood,

* See 'Quarterly Review,' vol. 156, pp. 216, foll.

at least in England. Neither corruption nor want of money would, however, seriously influence the opening operations of a war, but both would tell in the long run, and combine, with other causes we have mentioned, to assist England in a prolonged struggle. Half the sufferings of the Russian armies during the last Turkish war were due to administrative incapacity and corruption, and there is no reason to suppose, that any great improvement has taken place in a system which owes its defects to the vices of the national character. As regards financial difficulties, these would, in the first place, be met by increased activity in the Government Bank-Note printing establishment, and secondly, and with absolute certainty, by failure to pay the interest on foreign loans. By these measures Russia, though completely bankrupt, would struggle on for some time, but it must be remembered that financially, she begins now where she left off after the last Turkish war. In the critical moments of the present Bulgarian difficulty the value of the Russian paper rouble has again fallen to the lowest point reached after the Plevna disasters. Financial considerations were as influential as any others in procuring Russia's acceptance of the Berlin Treaty, and similar difficulties would soon be felt in a new war, and would daily increase as the struggle was prolonged.

The internal condition of Russia is a subject so large, varied, and interesting, that, in an article like the present, it is only possible to touch lightly on the chief points affecting the question immediately under discussion. We trust, however, that we have brought forward sufficient arguments to show, that when engaged in a long struggle with England, such as the latter can easily maintain, the Tsar would find that the continued presence of foreign enemies on Russian territory was not the only danger with which he would have to contend.

In conclusion, we hope that we may have done something towards tranquillizing the fears of those who, whilst recognizing the dangers with which Russia threatens us, tell us that we are powerless to avert them. We too recognize the great dangers which gather round us; we are no advocates of war; but we hold, that the best way to meet a danger is to study its nature and to face it resolutely. We have therefore endeavoured to impress on our readers the nature and reality of the perils which threaten us from Russian aggression; and, in support of our statements, we have been glad to refer to the evidence of so valuable and independent a witness as Mr. Benjamin. But, though fully sensible of the gravity of the situation, we have no fear for our country. England can hold her own whenever

whenever she makes up her mind to action. No friendly hand was outstretched towards Bulgaria till England spoke. The liberties of the Principality appeared to be hopelessly at the mercy of the Tsar, till Lord Salisbury's stirring words at the Mansion House rang throughout Europe. Then, but not till then, it was found that other countries were of one mind with England. Outraged public opinion in Europe gladly recognized the voice and echoed the sentiments of the old champion of national liberties, and even the proud Tsar was forced to pause and consider. If English policy is conducted with prudence, and English statesmen, trusting and trusted by their countrymen, are ready to act promptly when necessary, it is Russia that has cause to fear, and not England. The British Empire is solidity itself as compared with the Empire of the Tsar. The circumstances of the case permit England to-day to meet Russia with far greater certainty of success, than if she engaged in a war with any other first-class Power. But to secure success, Englishmen must continue to believe in themselves, their own powers and resources—they must remember that the 'Russians must not have Constantinople'—and they must put away all superstitious fear of the Russian bugbear. Above all, England must be prepared for the struggle which she cannot avert. She must resolutely take up the task of putting her house in order; and the acknowledged deficiencies of her armed forces must be remedied without a moment's delay. If patriotism is still a national virtue, and we are confident that it is shared by Radical, Whig, and Conservative alike, let us insist on instant and prudent preparation. Englishmen of all classes are ever ready to accept sacrifices necessary for the maintenance of their Empire and their independence. And the statesmen who doubt it will find, that they have lost sight of the strongest and best sentiments of a free and ruling nation.

ART. X. — *Petition addressed to the Hebdomadal Council for the Foundation of a School of Modern Literature.* Oxford: Printed at the Clarendon Press, 1886.

IT is with no small satisfaction that we are able to announce, that our recent article on English Literature at the Universities has not been without effect. The serious deficiency, which it pointed out in an important department of education, is now generally acknowledged. The necessity of endeavouring to supply that deficiency is admitted on all sides, and the opinions, which three months ago we appeared to be alone in maintaining, have been corroborated by such a consensus of authoritative opinion, that it would be impossible for any Council of educational legislators to disregard them. It will be remembered that what we advocated was this: the recognition on the part of the Universities of the claims of the *Literæ Humaniores*, in the proper sense of the term, to a place in the curriculum of Academic study. We pointed out, that the time had come when it was necessary to distinguish between a literary and philological study of the Greek and Roman Classics, between their interest as monuments of language and their value as the expression of genius and art. We urged the claims of our own literature to a place in the curriculum of the same school, not simply on account of its growing importance as a subject of study throughout the kingdom and in the colonies, and the consequent necessity of the Universities providing adequately for its interpretation, but because of its intimate, its essential historical connection with ancient Classical literature, and because of its efficacy as an instrument of culture, if studied side by side with and in the light of the literatures which nourished, moulded, and coloured it. We showed how by thus associating the three leading and master literatures of the world, and by thus encouraging a liberal and enlightened treatment of them, each would gain in interest and value, as each would gain in efficacy and vitality: the study of the Greek and Roman Classics would at once, we contended, be placed on the only footing on which in modern times it is possible to justify it; and the study of our own literature, rescued from the degradation into which pedantry, dilettantism, and sciolism have sunk it, would be raised to its proper level in education.

We were of opinion, therefore, and are still of opinion, that if, under these conditions, English literature were admitted to a place in our Universities, a great deficiency in the economy of

Modern education would be supplied, and the classical side of education would immensely gain. But nothing, we are convinced, could be more disastrous—disastrous alike to culture, to learning, to letters—than to attempt to substitute our own literature and the literatures of the modern world for those of Greece and Rome, or even to admit those literatures to a place in the curriculum—we are speaking of the Honour curriculum—unless in close association with the ancient Classics. Culture would suffer: for what competent judge, from Jonson to Arnold, has ever had two opinions about the relative educational value of the archetypal masterpieces of antiquity and the noblest monuments of Teutonic and Romantic Art? Learning and Taste would suffer: for what exegesis could be historically and critically sound, which did not trace formal characteristics to their origin, did not apply the standards and touchstones common to those who have been truly initiated and rightly taught? Letters would suffer necessarily and inevitably, necessarily and inevitably as effects follow causes. We entirely agree with Dr. Craik that, if the study of English Literature be not inseparably connected with the classical curriculum, the Universities will do wisely, both for their own sake and for the sake of education generally, to continue to exclude it from their Schools.

It is therefore with just alarm that we hear, that the Hebdomadal Council at Oxford are, in obedience to a petition recently presented, considering the desirableness of founding a School of Modern Literature, a school in which English Literature is to hold a prominent place, and in which Classical Literature is, if retained at all, to be retained as a subordinate or optional subject. Now, if any confidence could be placed in the firmness and wisdom of University legislators, they might be safely left to decide this question for themselves. But, unhappily, no such confidence can be placed in them. During the last ten years, their Councils have been torn by two factions—the one representing the spirit of progress and experiment, and labouring to adapt University education to the practical requirements of modern life by developing it on the positive and scientific side, the other clinging with uncompromising tenacity to the old methods and to the old traditions. So far the two parties, though constantly opposed to one another, have not come into any violent collision. The modern party have refrained from meddling with the questions in which their opponents are most interested, the constitution and economy of the Classical Schools, and have contented themselves with providing for the subjects which more immediately concern them—

for the study of natural science in all its branches, for the study of modern history, of political economy—for the study, in short, of all those subjects which belong to what is called the Modern as distinguished from the Classical side of education. This party, which is increasing yearly in numbers and influence, has the immense advantage of being in union with popular opinion, and of having as its allies all who believe that the object of education is not to cultivate, but to plant; not to elevate and refine, but to provide on the one hand what will be practically useful in practical life, and to provide on the other hand what will further the interests of scientific as distinguished from literary culture. The fact, that the Greek and Latin languages are no longer spoken, is with them a sufficient reason that they should be no longer read. Not very long ago one of their leaders publicly observed that, as an acquaintance with English History was more desirable than an acquaintance with Greek History, he saw no reason why Gregory of Tours should not be preferred to Thucydides. Indeed the sentiments of these revolutionists with respect to Classical Literature cannot be better expressed than in the words of a letter, recently written by Mr. John Bright to a correspondent, who had asked him whether in his opinion the classics of modern Europe were, from an educational point of view, an equivalent for the classics of Greece and Rome. After observing that he had just been reading the Dialogues of Plato in Mr. Jowett's translation, and had been 'more astonished at the wonderful capacity and industry of the Master of Balliol than at the wisdom of the great Philosopher of Greece,' Mr. Bright went on to say:—

'You ask me if I believe that the Classics of the modern world are an equivalent, from an educational point of view, for the Greek and Roman Classics. I answer that as probably all the facts of history or of biography or of science are to be found in modern translations, it follows that the study of ancient languages is not now essential to education so far as the acquisition of knowledge is concerned; and that as the study of the best writers of English must be more effective in creating and sustaining what we may term Classic English than the study of any dead language can be [Mr. Bright had remarked in a preceding paragraph that "to have read Greek among the Romans would not have done so much to create and continue a Classic Latin as to read and study the best books of Roman writers"], it seems to follow that the Classics and the Modern World are from an educational point of view an equivalent for the Greek and Roman Classics. The knowledge of the ancient languages . . . is useful from the fact that science has enlisted it in its service.'

The opinions of these revolutionists are every term gaining ground,

ground, and their policy is now aggressive. Indeed nothing is more certain than that, if a stand is not made against them, they will soon get the management of the Universities into their power, and the strongholds of Classical culture, assailed from within and assailed from without, will be in the hands of its professed opponents. Such a revolution would, in truth, be nothing less than a national calamity.

The crisis has now come; the test question is defined and under discussion; and the test question is this: Whether the study of our national literature—for its admission to a place in the curriculum of the University is now, we believe, virtually settled—is to be associated with the study of the Greek and Roman Literatures, or whether it is to be disassociated from those Literatures and to form the nucleus of a curriculum of Modern Literature? On the decision of that question depends—depends, we believe, permanently—the future of the higher education of this country, and of all that is involved in the maintenance of the standard of that education. If a school, an Honour School of Literature be founded at Oxford, as it has already been founded at Cambridge—with what success we have recently seen—in which the Classics do not form an essential part of the course, the immediate result will be the depression and subordination of the Classical element in University culture; the ultimate result will be the elimination of the Classics from the curriculum of liberal education, and their retention merely as material for philological study.

That there are ample reasons for fearing that the important movement, which is now on foot, is in danger of being misdirected, and of involving in its misdirection incalculable mischief to education, is unhappily only too apparent. In our former article we protested against the transformation of a Chair, originally founded in the interests of literary culture, into a Chair designed merely to further the interests of philological learning. We have now to protest against something much more serious. The perversion of the Merton Chair was, it seems, merely a preliminary step. A Professor, elected on such a theory of the scope and functions of a Chair of Literature, is to be succeeded by a School, framed in accordance with the same theory of the scope and functions of a School of Literature. What the constitution of that school is to be, Professor Max Müller has recently explained. It is

‘to consist of three branches—Teutonic, Romanic, and Celtic. The Teutonic is to be subdivided into an English, German and Scandinavian section; the Romanic into a Southern (Provençal and Italian), a Northern (French), and possibly a third section comprising Spanish

and

and Portuguese. These are as yet *pia vota* only; but I have that faith in young Oxford that, with certain modifications, and possibly after some hesitation, some such scheme will be carried.'

And 'some such scheme' is now embodied in the 'Petition' which stands at the head of this article. When we observe that in this 'scheme,' drawn up by Professor Max Müller and his disciples, the Greek and Roman Classics have no place at all, and that the whole is evidently designed purely in the interests of philology; and when in addition we remember the great influence which Professor Max Müller exercises in Oxford, all who have the cause of literary culture at heart may well tremble for its prospects at the present crisis. We trust, however, that the Hebdomadal Council will not permit themselves to be either deluded or misled. They have far more important interests to consult than the interests of a sect of technical scholars. What is expected from them has, during the last three months, been proclaimed definitely and imperiously by the voice of the whole nation. They are asked to make adequate provision for the cultivation of the Literæ Humaniores, not in the philological, but in the proper sense of the term; and especially for the cultivation of our vernacular literature. They are asked to provide for the efficient education, not only of those students who will, on quitting the Universities, follow pure literature as a profession, or at all events become contributors of more or less importance to it, but of those who will become its apostles and exponents in other capacities—who will fill the Chairs of Literature which the modern side of education is every year multiplying—multiplying in the provinces, multiplying in the Colonies; who will be enlisted in the same service, as teachers in our Public Schools, as University Extension Lecturers, as Lecturers at Girton, Nuneham and similar seminaries, as Lecturers in the innumerable Institutes scattered up and down the country. They are asked to send forth teachers conversant, not with the origins and antiquities of Literature, not with its barbarous and semi-barbarous experiments, its Bersah Sagas, Tain Bôs, Beowulfs and Chansons de Roland, but with its masterpieces and mature expression. They are asked for critics, they are asked for initiators; they are not asked for philologists. They are asked—for they are the legislators of the centres of culture—to provide, as efficiently as they can, for the training of those who will emerge from their schools to create the literature and especially the popular literature of the future, and whose aims and tone as writers will be in a large measure determined by early impressions. They are asked to educate those who are to educate the world.

world. Up to the present time these men have been obliged to take their training into their own hands, and to pursue it collaterally with the sort of training which the Universities are competent to give. But, in pursuing this independent path, they have had too often to pursue it at the heavy price of receiving no share in the prizes which are the rewards of Academic distinction. Not that Oxford and Cambridge are indifferent to literary eminence, or have no pride in such of their sons as do them honour. If philologists and technical scholars enjoy the substantial rewards of learning—the mere loaves and fishes—it would be ungenerous to forget the many instances of men who, having succeeded after a life of poverty and depression in achieving literary fame, have lived to see that fame gracefully recognized in an Honorary Fellowship or an Honorary Degree.

The Hebdomadal Council will, we think, do wisely, if, at this momentous crisis, they pay serious attention to the opinions which our recent article has elicited. These opinions are now lying before us. Some of them are in the shape of private letters, which we now publish for the first time with the consent of the writers; others have appeared during the last six weeks in the columns of the 'Pall Mall Gazette,' a journal which has honourably distinguished itself by the ability and consistency with which it has supported us in pleading the cause of Literature and Education.

The first point, to which we would draw attention, is the authoritative and comprehensively representative character of these opinions—is the fact that they have emanated, not from men who are of probationary or secondary repute, or who belong to a particular calling, but from men pre-eminently distinguished in all walks of life; from the Archbishop of Canterbury, from the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, from the Lord Chief Justice, from the late Lord Chancellor, from men who fill or have filled the first places among English School Masters or University teachers, from the Bishop of London, from Archdeacon Farrar, from the Dean of Winchester, from the present Head Masters of Rugby, of the City of London School, of Wellington, of Clifton; from the most cultivated of contemporary statesmen, Mr. Gladstone, the Earl of Lytton, the Earl of Carnarvon, Mr. John Morley; from the most distinguished man of science now living, Professor Huxley; from men of letters like Mr. Froude, Mr. Matthew Arnold, Sir Theodore Martin, Mr. Addington Symonds, Mr. Courthope, Mr. Walter Pater, Mr. Frederic Myers; from men not less distinguished in other spheres of intellectual activity,
from

from Professor Bonamy Price, Professor Max Müller, Professor Alfred Goodwin, Professor John Hales; from Heads of Houses in the University itself, from the Master of Balliol, the Master of University, the Rector of Lincoln, the President of Trinity, the Provost of Oriel, the President of Magdalen, the Warden of All Souls, from the Principal of the Nonconformist College. The second point, to which we would direct attention, is the remarkable uniformity with which these opinions, thus various in their sources, corroborate the views expressed by us in our recent article. On the necessity of our Universities providing adequately for the study of Literature, and particularly English Literature, as distinguished from Philology, there is not, if we except Professor Max Müller, an obstinate philologist, a dissentient voice.

No one has expressed himself more strongly on this point than Professor Huxley:—

'The relation of our Universities to the study of English Literature is a matter of great public importance, and I have more than once taken occasion to express my conviction, firstly, that the works of our great English writers are pre-eminently worthy of being systematically studied in our Schools and Universities, as literature; and secondly, that the establishment of professorial chairs of philology under the name of literature may be a profit to science, but is really a fraud practised upon letters. That a young Englishman may be turned out of our Universities "equipt and perfect," so far as their system takes him, and yet ignorant of the noble literature which has grown up in these islands during the last three centuries, is a fact in the history of the nineteenth century which the twentieth will find hard to believe.'

Equally in favour of the admission of English Literature into the curriculum of University studies, and equally opposed to its being confounded with Philology, is the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is strongly

'in favour of the Universities providing for the adequate study of English Literature, especially as the Universities undertake to provide instruction in English Literature through their Extension Lectures and through the teachers in schools, and professors in the various colleges and institutes which the modern side of education is every year multiplying both in Great Britain and in the Colonies.'

To the testimony of the Archbishop of Canterbury may be added the testimony of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster:—

'I fully agree with the Quarterly Review, that in the curriculum of University study Literature, as distinguished from Philology, ought to be cultivated. Philology is as necessary to Literature as analysis to

to Chemistry ; but it is subordinate and cannot supply its place. By literature I understand the intellectual product of cultivated nations . . . and in this full sense it is evident that English Literature ought to form a part of University studies. I believe that the office of a University is not so much to fill men's minds with information, however valuable it may be, as to educate the man himself.'

His Eminence then goes on to point how greatly an intelligent comparative study of the Greek, Roman, and English Literatures would contribute to this result. Next comes Sir Theodore Martin, of whose own great services to culture and polite literature it would be impertinent to speak :—

'It is,' writes Sir Theodore Martin, 'incomprehensible how the effective study of English Literature should not have been provided at the Universities long since as an essential part of a gentleman's education, irrespective of the case of the many who may, either by writing or teaching, have to deal directly with English Literature in future life. It is in the years spent at the University that the time for such a study is most available, and the powers for acquiring a competent knowledge of what it should teach are most active. . . . It is in these early years that a true taste for literature is best formed, and that an acquaintance may with least difficulty be gained with all that is best in our native literature.'

No one will suspect Professor Jowett of sympathizing with any unnecessary innovation in University economy, but he is 'strongly of opinion that a place should be found for English Literature in the University curriculum.'

To the same effect are the opinions of Canon Farrar, and of the Head Masters of Rugby and Clifton. Canon Farrar, after observing that the teaching of English Literature has long tended to become too exclusively philological, agrees with us in thinking that, if such a study of literature as we have advocated were encouraged at the Universities, it would be of inestimable service 'in spreading a just, genial, and catholic appreciation for every form of literary excellence.' The Head Master of Rugby has, he says, no doubt that the admission of English Literature into the curriculum of University study would not only be of real advantage to the University, but could be introduced 'without in any way involving dislocation of present arrangements.' The Head Master of Clifton College bases the desirableness of the Universities encouraging a liberal study of our Literature on another ground. He observes, that in Schools 'the teaching of Literature will in general be either the getting up of little annotated text-books, with their scraps of philology and ready-made criticism and antiquarianism, for purposes

purposes of examination, very often at the expense of neglecting the text,' and that it should therefore be the province of the Universities to provide that enlightened instruction in this branch of study—the importance of which he fully recognizes—which the Schools do not provide. To these opinions it is pleasing to add that of one of the most distinguished classical scholars now living, and that of one of the most accomplished of modern men of letters.

'I am,' says Professor Alfred Goodwin, 'decidedly of opinion that the systematic study of English Literature ought to find a place among the subjects of a University course, and I should gladly see the establishment of an English Literature Division in the Final Schools at Oxford.'

Mr. Addington Symonds remarks, that what is wanted

'is some plan whereby the study of English should be combined with the study of Classical Literature, and become a necessary element in the education of every undergraduate who aspires to honours or reads for a degree. English, in my opinion, ought to enter as a subject into the examination of each student on whom the mark of the University is stamped.'

Not less definite and emphatic are the opinions which have been expressed as to the necessity of associating, in any School or Course of Literature, which may be provided or prescribed, the study of our own Literature with the study of ancient Classical Literature. As this is the point on which we have laid most stress, and to which we attach so much importance that we have no hesitation in saying, that the introduction of English Literature into the curriculum of University studies would, under any other conditions, be as undesirable as under these conditions it would be desirable, we wish to draw particular attention to the following corroborations of our opinion. The resident dignitaries of the University may perhaps be suspected of being unduly prejudiced in favour of classical studies. We shall therefore content ourselves with quoting the testimony of the Master of Balliol and the Rector of Lincoln:—

'I am,' writes Professor Jowett, 'as strongly of opinion that in an Honour School of English Literature or Modern Literature the subject should not be separated from Classical Literature, as I am of opinion that English Literature should have a place in our curriculum.'

'Should a School of English Literature,' writes the Rector of Lincoln, 'be established in the University of Oxford, I should take it for granted that the subject would be taught in connection with the Greek and Latin Classics. It seems to me the only scholarly method of such a study. A knowledge of the Classics may not indeed

indeed be necessary to the ordinary reader for the appreciation and enjoyment of English Literature, but it is quite indispensable to the student of English literary history. Without such a knowledge much of the matter and form of our literature can have no intelligible meaning. Its development must seem to be merely accidental without constant reference to the models on which it has been shaped. And the study of English Literature in this place, in connection with that of the Classics, would have the further effect of giving more life and reality to the method of studying Greek and Latin authors.'

In this last remark we have a view of the question which deserves, we think, particular attention. We are not, like Lord Coleridge, disposed to believe that the Classics are a 'lost cause,' but there can be no doubt that they would greatly gain in interest and educational value, if their relations to modern literature were made more generally intelligible. 'Much,' says Mr. Pater, 'might be done for the expansion and enlivening of classical study itself by a larger infusion into it of those literary interests which modern literature in particular has developed, and a closer connection of it, if this be practicable, with great modern works.' And the Master of Balliol in a private letter to us makes a similar remark; 'classical study is getting in some respects worn out, and the plan proposed would breathe new life into it.' 'It would act favourably on classical study,' observes the Head Master of Wellington, 'saving it from pedantry, and also lessening the prevailing disposition to subordinate too completely its literary to its philosophical and historical interest.'

Mr. Gladstone, Lord Carnarvon, and many others, protest against English Literature being recognized by the Universities as a subject of study, unless it be associated with the Greek and Roman Classics, on the ground that, if divorced from the study of ancient Literature, its introduction will tend to disturb and weaken the present classical system. 'Your subject,' Mr. Gladstone writes to us, 'is one worthy of any effort, and I sympathize with what I understand to be your views, utterly deploring whatever tends to displace a classical education for those in any way capable of receiving it, and strongly disapproving all efforts in that direction.' Mr. Gladstone then goes on to say, that he agrees with those who think that, 'unless English Literature be studied in connection with the Greek and Roman Classics, its introduction into the Oxford examination system would be injurious to the interests of education.' The testimony of Lord Carnarvon, though we cannot agree with his remark, that the study of English Literature 'comes far better at a later period of life when the foundations of knowledge

ledge have been laid and taste is more formed,'* is equally emphatic.

'If,' he says, 'it is certain that without prejudice to the Classics English Literature can be introduced into the University curriculum, no reasonable objection can be offered, but if its introduction tends to disturb or weaken the existing classical system, then I would unhesitatingly refuse the specious but perilous gift.'

We shall now proceed to show, how largely our views as to the necessity of associating the study of English Literature with that of Classical Literature on other and more important grounds, have been shared by authorities, whose names will be a sufficient guarantee for the value of their testimony. We will begin with the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose liberal and catholic views on all subjects connected with modern education add particular impressiveness to his conservatism on this point.

'The study of English Literature should,' he writes, 'be closely associated with the study of the Greek and Roman Literatures, not simply on account of their intimate historical connection, but because sound and adequate literary culture must be based on the study of its sources.' He would 'deplore any attempt to establish a school either for the independent study of our national literature, or of a study of it in connection only with modern literature.' He 'agrees with those who think that its proper place as an instrument of education and as a branch of study is with the literatures of Greece and Rome.'

Equally definite and equally emphatic is the opinion of the Bishop of London :—

'I have no doubt,' he writes to us, 'that the Universities ought to take up the study of English Literature, and I have equally no doubt that English Literature ought to be studied as one of the fruits of the Classical Literature which preceded it, and from which it derives most of its inspiration and very nearly all its ideals. If it were possible for one human intelligence to embrace all literature, ancient and modern, within one course of study, this, and this alone, would be the right method. But since this is impossible, and a division must be made, I am sure that to divide English Literature from Ancient is to destroy the study as a study of Literature. A division which separates the stream is inevitable; a division which crosses the stream is an absurdity.'

The opinion of Mr. Matthew Arnold is to the same effect. He should, he says, 'be glad to see at the Universities not a new school established for Modern Literature or Modern Languages, but the great works of English Literature taken in conjunction

* See Lord Lytton's admirable remarks in his letter to us, page 254.

with

with those of Greek and Latin Literature in the final examination for honours in *Literæ Humaniores.* 'And I would,' he says in another place, 'add no literature except that of our own country to the classical literature taken up for the degree, whether with or without honours, in arts.' And what Mr. Matthew Arnold says is repeated and supplemented by Professor Bonamy Price, who is 'very strongly in favour of the great works of English Literature being carefully and thoroughly studied in combination with those of the great Greek and Latin writers.' 'For,' he adds, 'the rigorous attention which the classical writings demand and exact from those that study them will bear most valuable fruit when applied to the brilliant and powerful utterances of modern thought.'

To pass, however, from the testimony of those, who are or who have been officially connected with education, to the testimony of those whose eminent services to Modern Literature give particular weight and significance to their remarks on the relation of Classical to Modern Literature. 'No one,' writes Mr. Froude, 'can be a finished scholar and critic who is ignorant of Classical Literature, and both the national taste, and the tone of the national intellect, will suffer a serious decline if it ceases to be studied among us.' We are unfortunately not at liberty to publish the opinion which one of the most eminent of living poets has expressed on this subject, but we shall, we trust, be guilty of no breach of confidence in stating, that he takes precisely the same view of the necessity of basing the higher culture on the study of the ancient masterpieces, and of the inadequacy of any system of literary culture which does not rest on that basis, as we have taken.

But we have particular satisfaction in quoting the testimony of Mr. John Morley, for there are indeed few men whose judgment on this subject is less likely to be biased by idols of the den. His sympathies would appear to be almost entirely with modern life. The greater portion of his writings has been devoted to modern subjects. His connection with contemporary politics would seem to estrange him even more completely from the world of Pericles and Alexander, and to link him even more closely with the world of Mr. Bright and Mr. Chamberlain.

'I am strongly of opinion,' writes Mr. Morley, 'that the systematic study of English Literature in its widest sense would be a valuable addition to the course of University education. By literature I assume you to mean not merely words and form, philology and style, but the contents of important writings in their relation to human thought and feeling, and the leading facts of human life and society. I am not so foolish as to deny that education ought to include both a knowledge of the

the structure of our mother-tongue, and a manly care for its purity, its wholesome directness, its pithy vocabulary, in face of the affectations, barbarisms, and hideous importations that nowadays threaten to degrade and deface it. But the serious study of English books, as an instrument of systematic education, is not merely etymology, nor grammar, nor rhetoric. Literature, viewed as an instrument of systematic education, and not as a source of pleasant refreshment and delight, would mean a connected survey of idea, sentimental, imagination, taste, invention, and all the other material of literature, as affecting, and affected by, the great experiences of the human mind and social changes brought by time.

There is no reason why English Literature, in this construction of it, should be simply vague or elegant trifling, nor why it should not be as severe, as fortifying, and as permanently nourishing, as other studies that are capable of more precise definition. Villemain, Taine, and Ste. Beuve, have, among others, shown by example, how literature can be made a powerful and invigorating element in teaching, and the noble literature of our own country contains material and traditions of no inferior force and value for these purposes of the highest education.

2. As the object of a School of Literature should be not merely the supply of technical information, mostly *de minimis*, but the building up of the mind in habits of knowledge and thinking, it would be a great misfortune to leave out that classical basis upon which our literature mainly rests. It seems to me to be as impossible effectively to study English Literature, except in close association with the Classics, as it would be to grasp the significance and the bearings of medieval or modern institutions without reference to the political creations of Greece and Rome. I should be very sorry to see the study of Greek and Latin writers displaced, or cut off from the study of our own. They are incomparable masters of form, and they abound in civil and moral wisdom which is as fresh and as useful to-day as it was in the days of Thucydides or Aristotle. It is not any less important to realise the unity of Literature, than that unity of History on which Mr. Freeman has said so many just and important things; and it would be an absurd and unscientific division of the subject to divide knowledge of the modern superstructure from study of the ancient foundations.

Such broad and enlightened views as these, such just and scholarly conceptions of the aims and functions of a School of Literature, are not likely to find much favour with the 'Teutonic, Romanic, Celtic, and Slavonic' party, though they will, we trust, be not without effect on the Hebdomadal Council.

But Mr. Morley is not the only councillor from whom University Legislators may, in dealing with this question, learn the wisdom of the old admonition, *sursum corda*. For the weighty and eloquent opinion which we are now about to submit

submit to our readers we are indebted to the Earl of Lytton. With his Lordship's permission—for it originally took the form of a private letter—we print it at length. Lord Lytton's own distinguished services to Literature would give particular weight to any remarks which he might offer, however casually, on the present subject. But he has been good enough to go much further than this; he has been good enough to contribute an opinion which exacts and will repay the most careful consideration, and which will, we trust, be, in Bacon's phrase, chewed and digested by those who will learn from it not only the nature of the duties which rest on them at the present momentous crisis, but the manner in which these duties may be most efficiently performed.

'It certainly appears to me that, unless we are to regard the curriculum of our Universities as a course of instruction entirely confined to the *χρησима*, and in no wise concerned with the *θεωρημα*, there are special reasons why the study of English Literature should in these days form an essential part of it. I say in *these days*, because the exclusion of this subject from the original curriculum of our Universities was perfectly natural. For a long period of time they could not have better promoted the sound development of the national literature than by providing for the accurate study of the language and literature of Greece and Rome. But that much has been accomplished, and with the best results. The English Literature has now produced masterpieces of its own in almost every department. It has become one of the greatest and noblest literatures in the world; and what is now needed in the interest of it is, I think, an authoritative and efficient aid—not in the collection of its materials, or the formation of its methods, but in the preservation of its noble characteristics and the maintenance of its established standards. That such aid is increasingly needed, who can doubt? If the Universities cannot give it, whence is it to come? All that can be properly called literature seems to be now menaced with extinction by the disgorgements of the cheap popular press—with its superficial second-hand criticism, its flimsy summaries of the results of original scholarship or research, its slovenly vulgar editions of the English Classics, and its irrepressible floods of sloppy, foolish, illiterate fiction. I am quite unable to agree in the opinion of Lord Carnarvon, that "the study of English Literature comes better at a rather later period of life, when the foundations of knowledge have been laid, and taste is more formed." My own observation has led me to the directly opposite conclusion, that literary taste is a faculty quite distinct from, and to some extent independent of, the mere knowledge of books. In many men of copious reading who, without being exactly English scholars, were thoroughly familiar with all the masterpieces of English Literature, I have been surprised to find this faculty conspicuously defective, and occasionally I have been no less surprised by

by the strength of it in young persons, whose range of reading was comparatively small, but who, with minds unencumbered and unvitiated by trash, had seriously studied the works of a few great writers under conditions conducive to a subtle appreciation of them. I hope I do not overrate the intellectual or the moral value of what I would call "the literary sense." I know that noble character and vigorous intellect are to be found without it, and that it is not indispensable to the accumulation of knowledge. But it is a faculty which can only be acquired in early youth, and whilst of all faculties it is one of the most dependent on education, it is assuredly not the least important of the faculties, which any course of liberal education should endeavour to develop. In literature the foundations of taste must be laid with the foundations of knowledge, for literary knowledge without literary taste can have no literary value. In fact, taste is, in relation to literature, an habitual mental attitude contracted from the disciplined exercise of certain faculties, and corresponding to what in relation to science would be called "the scientific mind." I presume that no teacher and no well-wisher of science would say to the student of it, "Lay in the foundations of knowledge as soon as you please, but put off to a later period of life the mental discipline necessary to enable you to understand and use your knowledge scientifically." The taste formed in later life must in most cases be a taste formed at haphazard.

'On the second question raised in your letter, viz. whether English Literature should be studied in connection with the comparatively modern literatures of other countries, or the ancient literatures of Greece and Rome, I can scarcely recognize room for serious discussion. Whether the literatures of France, Italy, Spain, and Germany, should or should not be included amongst the subjects of exposition and research at Oxford and Cambridge, is quite another question; and on both sides of it much might be said. But one thing is certain. To a great extent all these literatures, like our own, have grown out of the study of the Greek and Roman Classics. In the classics they have themselves produced, the influence of that study is apparent. With perhaps a very doubtful, and at the most a very partial exception in the case of German Literature, the early history of all these literatures is substantially a history of the effects of Greek and Latin scholarships upon the first literary expressions of the intellectual life of the countries which have produced them; and in any case throughout the course of their development they have been largely indebted to the methods of thought and forms of expression extracted by medieval scholarship from Greek and Latin authors. Of all alike the fountain-heads are Greek and Latin. And however copiously a lecturer upon English Literature might employ the comparative method, in order to examine its character and trace its course in connection with the contemporaneous course and character of other modern literatures, I can scarcely see how he could avoid reversion at almost every step to the common well-spring of their all. Quite independently of this consideration, however, not only

only that the new Chair of English Literature would fail from the onset, to command the serious consideration which is essential to its success, but also that the general character of the Universities would be lowered if the study of literature (for that is what is really involved in the case) were divorced by them from the study of the classics, on which every civilized literature is founded, and with which their own reputation and national position are so vitally connected.

'On the subsidiary question; as to the method of instruction, I am equally in accord with what I understand to be your object. In so far as the Classics are to be studied in direct relation to English Literature, for Heaven's sake let them be studied *as literature*, and not as pretexts for philological pedantry! Some time ago the works of Shakspeare were, I believe, included among those upon which instruction "in pupil room" is occasionally given at some of our public schools. But I have been told that on all such occasions the plays of Shakspeare are subjected to the method of instruction habitually applied to the plays of Æschylus or Euripides, that is to say, they are treated not as literature, but as exercises in grammar and philology. Such a method, if it really has been adopted, must necessarily have the effect of concealing from, instead of revealing to, the student the literary features of the text. I have always rather wished and hoped to see the study of Grammar removed from the first to a much later period of the established curriculum, and treated in connection with the kindred studies of Logic and Philology as part of the science of language. And amongst other advantages incidental to such a change in the order of studies, I reckon the chance it would give to "the average schoolboy" of beginning his study of Latin and Greek with a livelier interest in the ideas, and a quicker and easier perception of the literary characteristics of the Latin and Greek authors given him to read.

'After all, of how many excellent Greek and Latin scholars are the literary style, and the literary taste, detectable? Is it because they have neglected the study of their native literature, or because the aims and methods of all their studies have been verbal rather than literary?

'As to foreign literature, I cannot but think that we are at present suffering from a too unrestricted importation of their modern forms and modernized ideas. I wish it were possible to establish some sort of literary Custom House, and levy import duties on foreign idioms.

'But when writers, whose rank in literature is high enough to carry with it some responsibility for the trusteeship of their native language, do not scruple to adulterate its vocabulary, and distort its structure by the copious employment of all sorts of Gallicisms, Germanisms, and Americanisms, it is surely high time for the Universities to exert with energy all the influence and authority they can command for the preservation of what is national and classical in the genius of English Literature.

'To intervene, however, with any chance of success, they must, as the "Quarterly" has so wisely insisted, provide for the study of English

Nothing that we could say could add weight to these thoughtful and impressive remarks.

Vol. 164.—No. 327.

and who are inclined to suspect that our fathers were at least as wise as ourselves.

We do not believe, therefore, in the modification of the curriculum of any existing school. Such a course would, we are convinced, lead to nothing but confusion and perplexity. As things now are, each school has a distinctive character and a definite aim. The aim of Moderations is, on the one hand, to secure and guarantee exact classical scholarship, and on the other hand to teach students to apply that scholarship to its proper use—the elucidation of the poetry, criticism, and oratory of Greece and Rome. The aim of the Final School of Literæ Humaniores is to supplement the literary course thus admirably initiated in Moderations with the austerer discipline of Philosophy and Science. Now the introduction of English Literature into the curriculum of either of these schools would obviously be most injudicious. It would seriously interfere with the classical element in Moderations. It would be entirely out of harmony with the subjects studied in the Final School.

We are satisfied that the true solution of the problem would be the foundation of a new Final School, of a school which should not supersede, which should in no way interfere with the present Final School of Literæ Humaniores, but which should correspond to it, and which should stand in the same relation to it as the old Law and History School used to stand to the old Literæ Humaniores School. In the former times a student would take his honours in Literæ Humaniores, and would then proceed to prepare himself for his second school, the School of Law and History, and it was within the reach of any man of intelligence and energy to take a first class in both courses. If he had not the energy or inclination to aspire to honours in both schools, it was open to him to take his choice between them, and to graduate in honours in 'Law and Modern History,' instead of in honours in 'Literæ Humaniores.' This second school was abolished on the ground, no doubt, that as the subjects represented in it had no direct connection with the subjects prescribed in the curriculum of the preceding school, it was impossible for students to attain with a year's reading, even though that reading had been aided by reading pursued collaterally with their Literæ Humaniores studies, a sufficiently high standard. But these objections would not apply to a School of Literature, for a portion of the work required for it would already have been accomplished in Moderations, and another portion of that work, the perusal namely of the lighter part of our own literature, would, so far from interfering with the preparation for Literæ Humaniores, form, as indeed it now does,

does, a pleasant relaxation for leisure hours.* Thus the student could take his honours in *Literæ Humaniores*, and would still have a year before him for the severe and systematic study, which the school we are advocating would necessarily exact. On the other hand, men who were less energetic, or whose tastes and aims were purely literary, would be enabled to graduate in honours in *Belles Lettres* instead of graduating in honours in Philosophy, Philology, and Ancient History, just as in former times it was open to men to graduate in Law and History, instead of graduating in *Literæ Humaniores*. We think, however, that the University would do well to require of every candidate for the Honour School of Literature that he should have obtained at least a third class in the School of *Literæ Humaniores*. For a purely literary curriculum would undoubtedly be too thin. Poetry, Rhetoric, and Criticism can never, from an educational point of view, be equivalents for Logic and Moral and Political Philosophy, and the elimination of those solid elements from the curriculum of culture would constitute a serious deficiency even in the education of a literary critic. In our opinion no student should be entitled to a degree in Arts, who had not an adequate acquaintance with the Ethics and the Republic.

If, again, we regard the constitution of the proposed school in its relation to the constitution of existing schools, we shall see how little it would disturb existing arrangements, and how easily and naturally it would supply an obvious defect in the classical course. The aim of Moderations is, as we have seen, to enable students to read the chief Greek and Roman Classics with facility and accuracy, to give them a minute acquaintance with particular works, or with portions of particular works, and to initiate them in the rudiments of literary criticism and of literary history, so far at least as they relate to the Greek and

* In addition to this, a youth would bring up from a school a certain amount of literary knowledge. Indeed we see no reason why he should not when he matriculates have made considerable progress in his English studies. The Universities, through their Scholarships, are virtually the dictators of the Public Schools, and we have little doubt that, if a paper on English Literature formed a recognized portion of the examination for Classical Scholarships, progress would be secured. The character of the questions set would determine the character of the instruction given, and would thus go far to remedy the defective teaching of which the Head Master of Clifton College complains. In speaking of the relation of the Universities to the Public Schools, we cannot forbear expressing a hope, that they will not countenance the recent extraordinary innovation of the Head Master of Winchester School. We are surprised that the Governors of that ancient institution should not have thought it their duty to intervene. If discountenanced by the Universities, it will seriously affect the interests of the School; if countenanced by the Universities, it will seriously affect the interests of culture.

Roman Classics. But all this is supposed to be accomplished in about two years, for Moderations is merely an intermediate school, and with Moderations the course of pure literature, thus admirably inaugurated, abruptly terminates. The classical student is then hurried on without option to the final School of *Literæ Humaniores*, a school in the preparation for which he passes at once from Poetry to History, from Oratory to Ethics, and from Literary Criticism to Logic. If he chooses to abandon Classics, it is of course open to him to select any final school he pleases. He can, if he is so minded, betake himself to Mathematics, or to Natural Science, or to Jurisprudence, or to Modern History, or to Theology. But what he cannot do is to complete his literary education, is to consolidate and extend those studies of which he had in Moderations been able to do little more than lay the foundations. We shall not be suspected of undervaluing the educational value either of Natural Science or of Modern History, and still less of Mathematics and Theology. Nor are we disposed on the whole to find fault with a curriculum, which is obviously designed to blend a certain amount of literary culture with the severe discipline of philosophy and science. But no students are, we repeat, entitled to greater consideration on the part of the Universities, than those whose future calling will be to disseminate literary culture, to deal directly with literary criticism and with literary history. Now it is surely most unreasonable that a class of students, who are to occupy so important a place in letters and culture, should have no opportunity of completing their education, should have no option but to break off the studies peculiarly suited to them just when those studies are beginning to be of real service, and might and ought to be extended. A Final School of Literature on the lines we propose is therefore as desirable in the interests of classical culture, as it is in the interests of the study of English. Its formal constitution might, we think, be modelled on the constitution of the present *Literæ Humaniores* School. In the curriculum of that school are included, as we have seen, Greek and Roman History, Logic, Moral and Political Philosophy, the History of Philosophy and a Special Subject. Now if for Greek and Roman History were substituted the General History of the Greek and Roman Literatures; for Moral and Political Philosophy, the General History of English Literature; for Logic and the History of Philosophy, Historical and Æsthetic Criticism; and for the Special Subject, which ranges from Textual Criticism to Comparative Philology, a critical examination of prescribed works, we should have a framework corresponding, or nearly corresponding, in its proportions to what

what is now partly a School of History, partly of Philology, and partly of Philosophy.

Thus the school we contemplate would group the subjects included in its curriculum thus. First would come Poetry; then would come Rhetoric, and Rhetoric would naturally subdivide itself into Oratory proper and into History, or rather into historical composition regarded as Rhetoric. Lastly would come Criticism, which might in its turn be appropriately subdivided into Historical Criticism, in other words, the History of Literature, and into Æsthetic and Philosophical Criticism. In the department of Poetry the classical portion should consist of passages for translation, selected from the leading poets of each era of Greek and Latin Literature, from Homer to Theocritus, from Lucretius to Prudentius, with elucidatory comments. The English portion should consist of questions framed with the object of ascertaining that the chief poems of each era had been thoughtfully perused, and that prescribed masterpieces,—the Prologue and the Knight's Tale, for example, the first and second books of the Faery Queen, half-a-dozen of Shakspeare's best dramas, the Paradise Regained, six books of the Paradise Lost, the Abolom and Achitophel, the Rape of the Lock, and the like—had been critically studied. In the department of Rhetoric the works offered for examination should, like the works offered for examination in Philosophy in the sister school, be specified by the Board of Studies, and what those works should be might be safely left to the discretion of the Board. In the Historical portion of the Department of Criticism papers should be set on the general history of the three Literatures, with a view to testing knowledge of their evolution and idiosyncrasies. And in addition to these papers a special paper on the direct and indirect influence of the Greek and Roman Literatures in moulding and modifying our own, and in particularly influencing the work of particular writers, ought undoubtedly to form a feature of the examination. Æsthetic, philosophic, and technical criticism should be represented by the Poetics, the third book of the Rhetoric, the *De Antiquis Rhetoribus*, the *De Structurâ Orationis*, and the *De Sublimitate*, in Greek; in Latin, by the Brutus, the *De Oratore* or a portion of the *De Oratore*, by the *Dialogus De Oratoribus* and the tenth book of Quintilian. And to these should be added that immortal treatise which stands with the *De Sublimitate* at the head of the higher criticism—the *Laocoon*.*

If

* Which could of course be studied perfectly well in one of the many excellent English translations. It is a proof of the indifference of the Universities to critical

If this scheme could be carried out, it would, it seems to us, not only serve to maintain that high standard of scholarship on which our Universities justly pride themselves, and without which the study of languages which are no longer spoken would be worse than useless, but it would, by extending the period of preparation from the period of school-life to the age of about three-and-twenty, enable students to peruse at least a third of what is most excellent in the pure literature of Greece, Rome, and England. It would enable them to make themselves masters of the great critical treatises—or of portions of those treatises—of which we have spoken, and of such works in English as represent what is best in the criticism of three centuries, from Sidney's *Apology* to Arnold's *Homeric Lectures*. It would enable them to encroach so far on Philosophy as to make the *Phædrus* and the *Phædo* their own—golden discourses, as precious, as indispensable, to the student of poetry as to the student of metaphysics. It would enable them to study analytically the *De Coronâ*, the *Philippics*, and *Olynthiacs*, the great *Oration of Æschines*, the great *Oration of Isocrates*, an oration or two of *Lysias*, half-a-dozen of the best orations of *Cicero*, two or more of best orations of *Burke*. It would afford them ample leisure for such an acquaintance with the histories of *Herodotus* and *Thucydides*, of *Sallust*, *Livy*, and *Tacitus*, of *Clarendon*, *Hume*, and *Gibbon*, as would be sufficient for the purposes of rhetorical culture. It would enable them to peruse and compare the masterpieces of the Attic and Roman Drama with the masterpieces of our own Drama; the two noblest Epics of the Old World and the yet nobler Epic of the New; the *Odyssey* and the *Canterbury Tales*: the *Metamorphoses** and the *Faery Queen*; the lyrics of *Pindar* and *Horace*, and the lyrics of those among our own poets, who acknowledged *Pindar* and *Horace* as their masters, or who have, in finding other sources of inspiration, rivalled, and more than rivalled, ancient artists. It would enable them to make themselves as familiar with the *Essay on Criticism* as with the *Ars Poetica*; with the *Satires* of *Dryden*, *Pope*, and *Johnson*, as with the *Satires* of *Horace*, *Persius*, and *Juvenal*; with such poems as *Alastor* and the *Atys*,

critical literature, that neither *Lessing's* masterpiece nor the *De Sublimitate* has a place in the curriculum of any school. The neglect into which the *Treatise of Longinus* has fallen is inexplicable. No nobler, no more suggestive, no more stimulating work has come down to us from antiquity. Yet there is not even a good modern edition of it. If some competent scholar would prepare a careful recension of the text, with notes and a translation, he would supply a real want. Will not Mr. Jebb help us?

* No classical work has exercised more influence on modern poetry, especially in England and Italy, than the *Metamorphoses*.

on the one hand, and the Rape of the Lock and the Coma Berenices on the other,* with the gems of the Anthology and the gems of Martial, as with the gems of our own not less brilliant Florilegia. It would enable them to pursue consecutively the course of Philosophic and Didactic poetry, from the Works and Days to the *De Rerum Naturâ*, from the *De Rerum Naturâ* to the Georgics, from the Georgics to the Essay on Man, and from the Essay on Man to the Excursion: of Pastoral and Idyllic poetry, from the Sicilian Idylls to the Bucolics of Virgil, from the Bucolics to the Mosella, and from the Mosella to such pieces as have in successive epochs of our own literature, from the appearance of the Shepherd's Calendar to the appearance of the English Idylls, been typical of the same class. It would enable them to understand the relations and to estimate the debt of our Narrative poetry to the Argonautica of Apollonius, to the Peleus and Thetis, to the Heroical Epistles, to the Pharsalia, to the Thebaid, to that brilliant Idyllic Epic, and that not less brilliant Allegoric Epic which, with other poems, once too much overrated, now too generally neglected, constitute Claudian and Prudentius the link between ancient and modern poetry.

But it is easy to legislate on paper, and we are of course well aware, that such a scheme as we have suggested is open to many reasonable objections. It may be urged that the curriculum, which we have sketched, is on the one hand much too wide, and on the other hand much too narrow. How, it may be asked, are Thucydides, Tacitus, and Gibbon to be approached only on the rhetorical side;† or how is a line to be drawn between Plato as he illustrates poetry, and Plato regarded generally in his relation to Metaphysics? Many well contend, that an acquaintance with the chief monuments of Anglo-Saxon Literature is to a student of English Literature at least as indispensable as a knowledge of the Greek and Roman Classics. Others will no doubt ask,

* A comparative study of Shelley's *Alastor* and the *Atys* would do more to make a student realize the fundamental and essential differences between Ancient and Modern Poetry than volumes of commentary; just as a comparative study of the *Coma Berenices* and Pope's *Mock Heroic*, would show him how much they have sometimes, and in particular branches, in common.

† And yet classical historical composition, now almost extinct, is as purely a work of art, and as worthy of being studied as a work of art, as a great poem or a great oration. If the matter concerns the student of history and the political philosopher, the expression and the style concern the literary critic. The study of their great Histories from this point of view was held by the Ancients to be one of the most important departments of rhetoric. To take an example. It is one thing to master the matter of Ségur's narrative of the great catastrophe of 1812, and of Thucydides' narrative of the great catastrophe of B.C. 413; it is quite another thing to understand, in what consists the immeasurable superiority of Thucydides to Ségur as a dramatic artist.

why the chief masterpieces in the principal literatures of modern Europe should not be substituted for works of less intrinsic value in ancient tongues; why, for example, in a curriculum which finds room for the Sicilian Idylls and the *Metamorphoses*, room should not be found rather for the *Inferno* or the *Purgatorio*, for *Faust* or for Molière's comedies? The Master of Balliol and Mr. Matthew Arnold, both agreeing in the necessity for connecting the study of the Classics with the study of English, would confine the curriculum of instruction to 'standard authors.' Others will protest against separating the study of literature from the study of history, pleading, and pleading with reason, the intimate connection between them. Others again will contend for the retention of philology, not on the ground of its identification with literature, but on the ground of its being one of those tangible subjects which are at once better adapted for purposes of teaching and purposes of examination than such volatile essences as the Excellent and the Beautiful. They will complain, with Mr. Pater, 'that the fine flower of English poetry or Latin oratory or Greek art will fade in the long, pedantic, mechanical discipline; perhaps the "cram" which is the necessary accompaniment of a system of examination.'

No one can appreciate more than we do the force of these objections. But in a problem so complicated as the determination of the best, and at the same time the most practical, method of legislating for a School of Literature, it is not, as we have already remarked, with the scheme which is open to no objections, but with the scheme which is open to fewest objections, that the choice must lie. It would, no doubt, be very desirable that, in addition to acquiring an adequate acquaintance with what is best in the works of the Greek, Roman, and English Classics, the student should acquire an adequate acquaintance with what is best in the writings of the Classics of Italy, France, and Germany, that he should be able to discuss the relative merits of the *Beowulf* and of *Cædmon's Paraphrase* in the original, and that he should possess a competent knowledge of philology and a competent knowledge of history. But to expect all this to be accomplished in the time now allotted to education is obviously absurd. Either Greek and Latin must be sacrificed for Anglo-Saxon and modern languages, or Anglo-Saxon and modern languages must be sacrificed for Greek and Latin. Philology must be cultivated at the expense of literary history and criticism, or literary history and criticism must be cultivated at the expense of philology. It would be an insult to Oxford to suppose, that she would sanction the institution

tion of a School of Literature in which the *Beowulf* superseded the *Iliad*, the *Chanson de Roland* the *Æneid*. Nay, it would be scarcely less derogatory to her, if she conferred this precedence on the maturest manifestations of Modern Art. It would defeat all the ends at which a School of Literature should aim, if Philology were forced into prominence, or even placed on an equal footing with those methods of exposition, by which alone the study of ancient and modern poetry, oratory, and criticism, can be rendered effective and fruitful. We are very far from under-rating the importance of Philology. In its highest departments it is a branch of learning of immense interest and value, and it is justly entitled to a place in the front rank of sciences. In its humbler departments it is an instrument without which the literary student would be helpless. But it must not be confounded with what in its higher departments it has little or no concern, and with what in its lower departments it serves only to assist. It must not be confounded with Literature. Up to the present time it has, in consequence of that confusion, been allowed to fill a place in education altogether disproportionate to its insignificance as an instrument of culture. As an instrument of culture it ranks, in our opinion, very low indeed. It certainly contributes nothing to the cultivation of the taste. It as certainly contributes nothing to the education of the emotions. The mind it neither enlarges nor refines. On the contrary, it too often induces or confirms that peculiar woodenness and opacity, that singular coarseness of feeling and purblindness of moral and intellectual vision, which has in all ages been characteristic of mere philologists, and of which we have appalling illustrations in such a work as Bentley's *Milton*. Nor is this all. Instead of encouraging communion with the nobler manifestations of human energy, with the great deeds of history, or with the masterpieces of Art and Letters, it tends to create habits of unintelligent curiosity about trifles. It too often resembles that rustic who, after listening for several hours to Cicero's most brilliant conversation, noticed nothing and remembered nothing but the wart on the great orator's nose. It is the privilege of Art and Letters to bring us into contact with the aristocrats of our race. It is the misfortune of Philology that, in its lower walks at least, it necessitates familiarity with a class of writers who probably rank lowest in the scale of human intelligence. The proper place of Philology in its higher phases, and of Philology in its higher phases we have not been speaking, is with the sciences. So far as it is related to Literature, it is related as the drudge is related to his master, as the key of the

the

the jewel-casket is related to the treasures it unlocks. Nor will the absurdity of forcing Philology into undue prominence in popular education be less apparent, if we regard it from another point of view. Those who can appreciate it as a science, and who are likely to be interested in what it teaches, are and always will be in a very small minority. And to how few even of this small minority, unless indeed they become teachers or specialists, will it ever be of much practical use, either directly in informing, or indirectly in educating. Those on the contrary, who appreciate Literature as distinguished from Philology, will in point of numbers quadruple, and more than quadruple, the former class. And two things are certain. Whatever may be the future calling of these students, the positive knowledge they will have attained will, unlike a knowledge of Philology, be of immense and immediate service to them; the liberal training to which, in the course of acquiring that knowledge, they have been submitted, will, unlike the narrow and narrowing discipline of mere philological culture, send them forth with enlarged minds and with cultivated tastes. Can there be any question then about the relative claims of Literature and Philology to precedence in the economy of education?

The truth is, that these two classes of students, separated by differences of temper, by differences of genius, by differences of taste, should be separately provided for. The inevitable result of forcing Philology into prominence in a School of Literature will be to defeat the purposes of the School. It will be to sacrifice the education of that large majority, who are capable of benefiting from literary studies, and are not capable of benefiting from scientific studies, to the education of a small minority. It will be an attempt to amalgamate elements which always have met and always will meet in oppugnancy. The instincts and faculties, which separate the temperament of the mathematician from the temperament of the poet, are not more radical and essential, than the instincts and faculties, which separate the sympathetic student of Philology from the sympathetic student of polite Literature. And of all the sciences Philology is the most repugnant to men of artistic and literary tastes. It was the subject of the sarcasms of Milton and Dryden in the seventeenth century. It was an inexhaustible topic for the scorn and ridicule of the wits of the eighteenth century; and it has assuredly not met with much sympathy from the most distinguished men of letters in the present century. No one can doubt, that it has been the predominance of the philological element in the classical curriculum which has had the effect of inducing generation after
generation

generation of men, on whose writings the impress of Classicism is most unmistakably stamped, to turn with contempt from the schools, and to take their education into their own hands. No one can doubt, that it has been the predominance of that element, which has created so wide a gulf between the life that is stirring in our Universities and the dominant system. We well remember how, when it was once humorously suggested to the late Rector of Lincoln, that the following lines from the Dunciad should be inscribed in letters of gold over the doors of the Classical Schools, he replied with a smile, 'Substitute letters of lead, and you have my entire approval':—

'Since man from beasts by *Words* is known,
Words are man's province : *Words* we teach alone.
When Reason doubtful, like the Samian letter,
Points us two ways, the narrower is the better.
Plac'd at the door of Learning youth to guide,
We never suffer it to stand too wide ;
To ask, to guess, to know, as they commence,
As Fancy opens the quick springs of sense.
We ply the memory, we load the brain,
Bind rebel wit, and double chain on chain ;
Confine the thought, to exercise the breath,
And keep them in the pale of *Words* till death.
Whate'er the talents, or howe'er design'd,
We hang one jingling padlock on the mind.'

But the recent Regulations have, we are glad to see, entirely removed this stigma from University teaching; and in the Classical School Poetry, Oratory, and History, are no longer under the old degrading yoke. It now remains to see, whether the new School of Literature is to return to the ancient bondage and mark a retrograde movement, or whether, on the contrary, it is to strengthen, to consolidate, to complete what the Classical Schools have during the last few months happily initiated. No sensible man would grudge Philology the recognition which is its due in every University. There is not the smallest reason why it too should not have its school and its curriculum, but we protest against that school being the School of Literature, and that curriculum being the curriculum of Arts.

We have adverted to the objections which may, with more or less plausibility, be urged against a School of Literature constituted as we would propose to constitute it. But we have not yet touched on the objection which will probably carry most weight with the multitude. The School, which we propose, not only requires as an indispensable qualification, both in those who teach and those who learn, the possession of classical scholarship,

ship, but its curriculum is based on, and indissolubly bound up, with the Classics. Its effect therefore—and let the blunt truth be admitted—will be to exclude from its course all but classical scholars. Now this, we shall be told, is monstrous. Is it not, it will be asked, a School of English Literature that is needed, and ought a School of English Literature to be other than what its name implies? Are our youth, it will be angrily urged, to be excluded from the study of Modern Literature, because they are not acquainted with the literatures of antiquity? Are they to know nothing of Shakspeare, of Burke, of Molière, because they know nothing of Sophocles, of Cicero, of Terence? Is the student to receive no instruction about the virtues and niceties of his own tongue, because he is ignorant of the Greek and Roman tongues?

Our answer to this is simple. The School which we are advocating, and the School for which any University when providing for the introduction of a new branch of study into its curriculum ought first to legislate, is an Honour School. And the function of an Honour School is to establish and maintain the highest possible standard of instruction and attainment in the particular subject represented in it, to base discipline, not on what is secondary and derived, but on what is original and typical. It is to teach those who are in their turn to become teachers, to educate those who are to educate others. We contend then, that no man should be entitled to the diploma of an Honour School of Literature whose education has not fulfilled these conditions—who has not traced what is best in Modern Literature upward to its source, who is not intelligently familiar with the literary masterpieces of the ancients, who has not received the impress of classical culture.

Whether in addition to an Honour School it would be desirable to establish a Pass School of Literature may be a matter for future consideration. For our own part we have little doubt that, whether desirable or not, it will sooner or later become necessary. In that case there is of course no reason at all why the great writers of one or more of the chief European Literatures should not be substituted, optionally, or absolutely, for the Greek and Roman Classics, and studied in conjunction with our own Classics. In that case there is no reason why such a school, as would meet the approval of Mr. Bright and the most advanced of the modern party, should not be founded. For the functions of a Pass School are not the functions of an Honour School. We are, however, of opinion that it would be desirable even in a Pass School to require a certain amount of classical knowledge from the students. It should not in any case be an alternative school

school for the present pass *Literæ Humaniores* ; for a smattering of Aristotle and Tacitus is certainly preferable to a smattering of Shakspeare and Goethe.

To conclude. Whatever may be the decision of the Council at Oxford, whatever may be the fate of this movement, we shall at least have the satisfaction of feeling, that we have done all in our power to admonish, all in our power to prevent misdirection. In the interests of Literature and in the interests of culture we have pleaded for an institution, which will be beneficial or mischievous, a blessing or an evil, according to its constitution. The effect of that plea has been to mature a crisis, the full significance of which is not discernible to the common eye, but which is in truth one of the most momentous that has ever occurred in the history of education. Let us not deceive ourselves. What is now at stake is nothing less than the future of the higher culture of our country, whether expressing itself practically in teaching or reflectively in Art and Letters.

Classical Literature can never, it is true, become extinct, but it can lose its vogue, it can become, what Mr. Bright calls it, a luxury, become the almost exclusive possession of mere scholars, become in short influentially disassociated from the world of Letters and from the world of Art and culture. Every step in the progress of this alienation is a step in the progress of its decline. Philology cannot save it. Technical scholarship cannot save it. It must be linked with life to live, with the incarnation of what it too is the incarnation to prevail. Associate it as Poetry with Poetry, as Philosophy with Philosophy, as Oratory with Oratory, as Criticism with Criticism, and it will be vital and mighty. The University of Oxford has now to decide, whether this is to be done or not, or whether so far from this being done the Classics are to be ostracized from those dominions, over which for so many centuries they have reigned supreme, and the *Dii Minores* of later and lesser dynasties set up in their place ; whether in a School of Literature, in a School in which Poetry is represented, we are to look in vain for the names of Homer and Sophocles, of Virgil and Horace ; whether the study of Criticism is to be divorced from the study of Aristotle and Quintilian, and the study of Oratory from the study of Demosthenes and Cicero. This is the question—this and nothing less than this—now awaiting decision at the chief seat of English national culture.

ART. XI.—*Public Journals for December 1886 and January 1887.*

THERE is nothing much more uncertain in this world than politics, but even those who are fully alive to the fact were not prepared for the startling events which marked the close of 1886 and the opening of 1887. Who, at the beginning of the Christmas week, would have ventured to predict that, before many days had passed over, Lord Randolph Churchill would be out of office, and that Mr. Goschen would be appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer? Nothing whatever had been made known to the public, which could in the slightest degree prepare them for such a change as this. A change of great import it must necessarily prove, but at the same time we do not believe that it involves danger to the Union party. We cannot pretend to agree with those who assert, that the loss of Lord Randolph Churchill to the Ministry is one of so little consequence that it can be instantly made good. It must be an extremely partial and superficial view of the circumstances now surrounding us which can inspire such an off-hand settlement of the difficulty as that. We do not propose to pronounce judgment on the course of action pursued by Lord Randolph Churchill. Before that can be done consistently with fairness, or even with common-sense, we ought to have before us Lord Randolph's own account of his reasons for resigning. It is true that most of his critics have thought proper to dispense with that formality. They have set an example which has nothing to recommend it. It is perfectly well known that, by long established usage and etiquette, a retiring Minister cannot make any statement of the motives which have actuated him, until he receives the Queen's permission to do so. This permission cannot be accorded to Lord Randolph Churchill before the meeting of Parliament. He has therefore been placed under a manifest disadvantage, for while the press of the country and the whole body of his enemies, and not a few friends, have been free to denounce him, a seal has been placed upon his lips. It is not for us to attempt to make out a case for his defence; that task he, and he alone, is competent to undertake. But we cannot but feel a decided conviction, that his past services entitled him to a much larger measure of fair play—we will not say of generosity—than he has been accorded by many Conservatives who, in striking at their late leader in the House of Commons, do not seem to have realized that they were doing the work of the Parnellites and the Gladstonians. We decline to join in this work, though if it should appear that Lord Randolph Churchill

Churchill had no graver cause for his resignation than a mere difference of opinion with his colleagues on matters of detail, we shall have as little to say in his behalf as any of his enemies could desire. We have no right, in any case, to pretend to forget his great services to the country, or the immense labour and ability he has brought to bear upon his work in Parliament. During the Session in which he acted as Leader of the House of Commons, Lord Randolph Churchill displayed a quickness of decision, a readiness of wit, an alertness in reply, combined with a sagacity and firmness, which extorted the admiration of his bitterest enemies, and won the confidence of doubters on his own side. As a debater, there are not more than two or three men in the house who can enter for a moment into comparison with him. His industry is simply marvellous, and all his faculties are brought into active service in an instant. These are qualities which are not so common as many worthy persons appear to suppose.

It is obvious that the position of Lord Salisbury was rendered extremely difficult by the resignation of his ablest colleague. He was so placed that any course which he took was certain to expose him to much criticism. But most of this criticism must necessarily be ill-directed and ill-informed, for no one can possibly know all the circumstances so well as the Prime Minister. Nothing has occurred to shake the public confidence in him—on the contrary, the general faith in the stability of his character, and the purity of his aims, gave assurance to all classes throughout the country, that he would endeavour to do what was right, and to prevent any injury befalling the public interests. That he was ready to resign his office to Lord Hartington is perfectly well known, but this would have been a sacrifice which the Conservative party would have regarded with anything but equanimity. That he did right, however, in calling Lord Hartington at once to his side cannot be for a moment doubted. It is not only wise, but it is an imperative duty on the part of Lord Salisbury, to consult with Lord Hartington, in the present state of parties, before any policy or question of the first magnitude is decided. Lord Hartington is entitled to this on all grounds, among others on the ground of his high character and his entire freedom from anything like unworthy motives or sly intrigue. There is no one in whom Conservatives and Liberals alike ought to have greater confidence. Compared with him, the band which is left supporting Mr. Gladstone presents the most despicable figure ever cut in this world by men calling themselves politicians. But Lord Hartington is not a dreamer, and he must have known long before

before he reached England, that his own party would object to his being made Prime Minister in a House where the Conservatives have a great majority over all sections combined, omitting only the Parnellites. If he could have been induced to accept the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House, it would have been, under all the circumstances, an ideal arrangement, but that was just the difficulty—it was purely ideal. Lord Hartington doubtless saw the same objection to his accepting the second post, as there was to his taking the first; but his support of the Government, and his loyalty to his principles, shone out clearly through all the mists which surrounded the situation. He felt himself obliged, however, to decline to join the Ministry in any capacity, and we are not prepared to question the wisdom of his decision. The views of his followers have to be considered. In every community, there is a strong party feeling which is partly local and partly national. The local party can never be left out of consideration. The dissentient Liberals are not yet prepared to see their leaders enter into a formal junction with the Conservatives. If Lord Hartington had joined us, at this particular moment, the Gladstonians would have declared that he had merely cast off all disguise, and gone to his proper place. He can serve the Union cause where he is much more effectually, than if he were in a Conservative Ministry. That a true and permanent coalition may be effected before very long, we heartily hope, but the time for it does not appear to have yet arrived, and to attempt to precipitate a movement of that kind is only to precipitate disaster.

Failing Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen was put in Lord Randolph Churchill's place. That, however, is not by any means the same thing. Lord Hartington holds a position, both in his country and his party, to which Mr. Goschen has no pretension. We must all hope that the experiment—for as an experiment it must be looked upon—will succeed. One thing, we believe, is clear—Lord Salisbury has acted throughout with entire unselfishness, and with an earnest desire to study the public welfare, apart from any personal considerations whatsoever. We hope to see the temporary misunderstanding between our leaders disappear, for we need the services of both. Meanwhile, it cannot be questioned that we retain the statesman of long and varied experience at the head of affairs, and therefore there is not, and has never been, the slightest occasion for disquietude.

The cause of the Union, we must emphatically repeat, has never been for a single moment in danger, for Lord Randolph Churchill may safely be trusted to fight with all his strength for that,

that, and the Union party could not, therefore, be adversely affected by his resignation. That the resignation itself would be hailed by the Gladstonians as a sign of disagreement among the Unionists, was perhaps only natural, for drowning men cling to straws; but they very soon found out their mistake. The grotesque conference, which was speedily arranged by some of Mr. Gladstone's underlings, for the conversion of Mr. Chamberlain, proves that great hopes were entertained at Hawarden of the renewed success of the favourite old device—*divide et impera*. Mr. Chamberlain is, perhaps, not unwilling to get back into what is called the 'fold,' but we hesitate to believe that he is prepared to imitate his former chief so far as to discard all his most solemn professions in order to accomplish his object. That he was not sorry to see a commotion in the Conservative camp we may all readily understand, for he is our enemy, implacable and relentless, though acting with us for the moment on a single question. He acts with us, not because he likes us, but because he sees that the Union is to be saved in no other way. As for the 'interviews' and 'theatre excursions,' which have been advertised so freely in the newspapers, we may be pretty sure that it is not Mr. Chamberlain who has sought either for the excursions, or the subsequent publicity which was given to them. His 'faithful friend,' who is acting as a sort of telephone for Mr. Gladstone, desires the world to know that he is restored to Mr. Chamberlain's favour; beyond that, the frequent paragraphs in the papers have no significance. We have no doubt that Mr. Chamberlain was delighted at Lord Randolph Churchill's resignation, and would have done anything that he could to bring it about. But that he is prepared to give up the Union, and to stand before the country, with the rest of the Falstaffian regiment in Mr. Parnell's livery, we shall not believe until we see it done. And even if Mr. Chamberlain were capable of this bad faith, he would not be able to drag half-a-dozen Liberal Unionists with him in the path of dishonour. Seventy, at least, out of the seventy-seven would remain true to their cause. The only thing which would have received a fatal injury would be the reputation of Mr. Chamberlain. At present, however, we dismiss all these speculations as wildly improbable. Mr. Chamberlain has done excellent service to the Union, and it would be a great injustice to him to suppose, that he is now going to betray it at the instigation of the very men who betrayed him.

The Session, then, will open under no circumstances of discouragement. On the most important of all the issues before the country—that relating to Ireland—there is absolutely no

shade of difference of opinion among either Conservatives or Liberal Unionists. The policy on which we are now, and have always been agreed, was stated everywhere to the people during the elections, and it required but a few words to explain it. What we have to do is to maintain the Union, and to ensure the supremacy of the law. We very much doubt whether it would be desirable to enter upon any legislation for Ireland, of a wide and comprehensive kind, during the approaching Session. That some steps must be taken eventually to settle the agrarian question cannot be doubted. It is now generally admitted that Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, from first to last, has been a gigantic failure. The Land Bills of 1870 and 1881 have merely aggravated every difficulty which they were to remove from our paths for ever. Mr. Gladstone looks on at this failure with supreme complacency, and assures us that, if we allow him to repeal the Union, without describing it in that unpleasant manner, all will be well. But the nation has made up its mind not to be led any further on that road, and if the issue has to be put to it again, its decision will be even more emphatic than it was in 1886. For the people understand it even better now than they did then; Mr. Dillon's incendiary speeches, the 'Plan of Campaign,' and Mr. Gladstone's careful avoidance of any condemnation of that 'Plan,' have opened their eyes. They see that the Irish leaders, even at a time when they are on their good behaviour before the country, do not hesitate to proclaim a war of extirpation against the landlords. While Mr. Gladstone stands assuring us that 'peace and brotherly love' would be the results of his Separation Bill, Mr. Dillon goes about vowing vengeance on the Irish police, and Mr. Morley gives the Irish people to understand that in resistance to the law is their best and only hope. 'Ireland,' said this remarkable product of the Gladstonian 'system,' 'has got nothing except by making her resistance felt.'* Mr. Gladstone whispers peace—but so low that he takes care not to be heard in Ireland—while his tools do their best to stir up strife. Mr. Dillon's response to Mr. Morley's significant hints was made at Roscommon on the 4th of December. There is no man, he said, 'who does not know who will be the Government in Ireland within the next few years.' The time 'is at hand when the police will be our servants—when the Irish police will be taking their pay from Mr. Parnell. . . and I warn the men to-day who take their stand by the side of landlordism, and signalize themselves as the enemies of the people, *that in the day*

* Speech at Hawick, Nov. 30th, 1886.

of our power we will remember them. (Prolonged cheers.) There we have the true Irish sentiment, unadulterated by the old Parliamentary hand. Mr. Morley is a very poor politician—a mere dreamer and theorist; but when he points to ‘resistance,’ which means, as applied to a ‘nation,’ insurrection, he is a better interpreter of Irish feeling and opinion than Mr. Gladstone.

It is vain for Mr. Gladstone to delude himself with the idea, that the people are not keeping a sharp eye upon events. They perceive, if he does not, the enormous importance of Mr. Dillon’s speeches, and of the motives which have inspired the ‘Plan of Campaign.’ Moreover, they are not hoodwinked by childish by-play such as that into which Mr. Chamberlain has indiscreetly allowed himself to be led. There is no ‘middle course’ on this Irish question. Such of Mr. Gladstone’s supporters as are not ‘arm-chair politicians’ freely acknowledge that there are but two roads—the one indicated by Mr. Gladstone, the other by the Conservatives. Sir William Harcourt, when consenting to be ‘stewed in Parnellite juice,’ saw plainly enough that his great experience of trimming would for once be useless. Mr. Gladstone must keep hard and fast to the ‘irreducible minimum’ of a separate Parliament for Ireland, with an independent Executive; for if he departed from that, the Parnellites would depart from *him*, while his own party never would trust him again. Therefore Lord Wolverton, on the 4th of January, very frankly warned Mr. Chamberlain, that he must not expect to creep back into the Liberal party on his own terms. ‘Mr. Gladstone was in the proud position, that he need not and would not alter his policy to please Mr. Chamberlain.’ No concessions would be made from that side. It was in the face of such declarations as these that Mr. Chamberlain made arrangements for the grotesque ‘conference’ with Sir W. Harcourt and Mr. Morley.

The duty of the Conservative party in reference to Ireland is perfectly clear. The ordinary law must first of all be enforced with energy and vigour. We are not at all sure that this has been done, but at the same time we admit that the difficulties before the Government are great. The collection of rent under the ‘Plan of Campaign’ is only a misdemeanour, not, as some critics of the Government appear to suppose, an embezzlement. It must therefore be treated as a misdemeanour, and as a matter of course the offenders are allowed bail. The operation of justice in such cases is necessarily slow. But no one has any right to assume that the Government has been neglectful of its duty. In Sir Michael Hicks-Beach we have the ablest Irish Secretary that either party in the State could send to the
discharge

discharge of the most thankless and harassing of duties. There could not be a more judicious or more thoroughly capable man for what has well been called the post of honour in the present Administration. It is, then, but fair to take it for granted that he has done all that was possible; and it must also be remembered that the actual outrages in Ireland this winter have been rather under than over the usual number. The Irish leaders have felt it their duty to discourage open violence, and it is very important to take note of the fact that their instructions have been obeyed.

We take it for granted that the resignation of Lord Randolph Churchill will not, in the least degree, affect his attitude on the Irish question. The insinuation, that he was wavering in his duty to the country in that all-important respect, must be treated as malicious calumnies. Wavering on the part of any Conservative, when Ireland is mentioned, is not, in our opinion, within the range of possibility. There was evidently great excitement at Hawarden on Christmas Day, and Mr. Gladstone's letter to the new paper, which he fondly hopes will kill the 'Scotsman,' was a sufficient sign that once more he saw office within his reach. But he will find that he was mistaken. No Conservative, and we believe no Liberal Unionist, will give a vote which may involve the least risk of bringing Mr. Gladstone back to power. It took Mr. Gladstone some time to find out that the decision of the general election in 1886 went against him. It will perhaps require almost as long to convince him, that no section of the Conservative party intends to make him Prime Minister. Unanimity being certain on these points, it will remain for the Government to persevere with its determination to carry out certain measures which recent events have not in the slightest degree affected, and which brook of no further delay. First among these must necessarily come the Reform of Procedure in the House of Commons.

There will be opposition to this from several quarters, including our own side. Some few Conservatives have been heard to contend, that there ought to be no limitation placed on 'freedom of debate.' But freedom of debate is precisely what does not exist in the House of Commons under the present arrangements. Freedom to interrupt debate, to throw obstacles in the way of business, to turn the House into a bear-garden, all this exists, but not freedom of any other kind. We gave, in our last number, a description of the scenes which continually take place, and a transcript from the notes of short-hand writers of speeches which were actually delivered. This account made a considerable impression upon the country, but nothing can produce

produce the effect which would be produced, if the people could see for themselves the systematic manner in which the Parnellites set to work to humiliate and disgrace the House of Commons. The business of the day and night may be duly set down upon the paper, but no one can tell when it will be reached, or if it will be reached at all. The real work of the sitting, which ought to begin at five in the afternoon, may not be within sight at three the next morning. If the Chamber were cleared, and given up as an arena for the horse-play of the Irish members, or turned into a hall for the collection of rents under the 'Plan of Campaign,' it could not be more degraded than it is now. The present rules were adapted for usage when it would have been considered a dishonourable act to plan obstruction, with the view of trying how many of them could be set at nought without giving the Speaker a technical right to interfere. A very different state of affairs exists to-day. A large and compact party, held together under iron bonds of discipline, avow it to be their most cherished design to break up the British Legislature altogether. Another party, the disciples of the school which teaches the doctrine of 'resistance,' provides reinforcements whenever they are needed. The result is, that a rational method of carrying on business is put entirely out of the question. The Government is rendered powerless, and its chief Ministers are worn out in the effort to prevail against the conspiracy to throw everything into disorder. Independent members have no opportunity of making known their opinions, because the Government is obliged to seize upon any spare time which may be found. Those who argue, that an alteration of the rules would involve restriction of 'freedom of debate,' have evidently turned the matter upside down before looking at it.

We shall shortly see a renewal of these scandalous performances. The Parnellites will go in to 'break up the machine;' the more unscrupulous of the Gladstonians will help them, in the hope that, out of the general mischief, some harm will befall the Government. The Speaker—whose ability, vigilance, and impartiality are beyond all question—will be compelled to look on the greater part of the time, without any power of interfering. Mr. Parnell will go back to his lavender and cotton-wool, and leave his skirmishers to do the hard work. Sitting up late at night does not appear to agree with Mr. Parnell. But the members of his party who speak by contract are endowed with less scruple or more nerve. They will begin the Session in the spirit which they have so often displayed before. Three weeks or so will be thrown away in 'debate' upon the Address. That is one of the evils which ought to be stopped. Not more than
two

two or three nights, at the outside, should be allowed for the Debate on the Address. In former times, one night was thought amply sufficient, and three nights were very seldom given to any Debate, even on the most important of Bills. Then, after the Address, there are sure to be dilatory motions, and endless discussions about some Father Fahy, or other victim of 'Saxon oppression,' who is languishing in 'British Bastilles.' With these amusements, the time will pass merrily enough till Easter. In the meantime, members who are jealous for the freedom of speech will probably begin to think, that all freedom is based upon law, and that law in the House of Commons has become a dead letter.

The Government will commit a serious mistake, if it does not resolutely attempt to redress this great grievance of the nation—for it is the nation which suffers by the paralysis of its Legislature. It is not necessary that debate should be closed by a bare majority. Any majority will do, provided that it is not made so large as to involve an unreasonably large attendance of members. A majority of five-and-twenty, or at the outside of fifty, would be amply sufficient to prevent a tyrannical use of the new weapon of closure. A further precaution might be devised for the sake of reassuring the timid. It could easily be provided that the closure should be adopted only by and for the Parliament actually sitting. Let it be renewed, if necessary, by each Parliament. With such safeguards as these, how could the closure be made a means of oppression? Only under very exceptional circumstances can it be perverted to wrong uses, even where a bare majority suffices to call it into existence. The general feeling of a large assembly, the prevalent sense of justice and fair play, may always be trusted to prevent an abuse of powers which are intended only to secure order and regularity.

One thing is certain—in the absence of any remedy of this kind, no business worth mentioning will be transacted. The country has expected much from the Conservative Government, and if it is obliged to come forward and acknowledge itself reduced to impotence, the judgment upon it will be severe. We do not advise any sudden expeditions into new fields of legislation. But there is much to be done which cannot safely be neglected, and the people will look with great impatience on any such waste of time as that which has of late become so common. To persuade the great body of electors that the Conservative party is unable to govern, even with the help of Liberal Unionists, is one great object which the Parnellites and Gladstonians have set before themselves.

They

They will go to the House, day after day, with the intention of forcing that conclusion into the minds of all classes of the people. Hence, it is very desirable that Conservative members should pause a long time before being entrapped into giving this project any support. They may be told that obstruction has been worse before than it is now. But if it is still quite potent enough to prevent due attention to the affairs of the nation, it is no comfort to be told that it might be worse. Equally immaterial is it to discuss the question, who originated obstruction, and who has countenanced it in former Sessions? The duty now incumbent upon the representatives of the people is to put it down. Until this is done, nothing can be done. The Government will find it hard even to get the money which is wanted for the Services and Departments. The House of Commons will be in the hands of Mr. Parnell and his lieutenants. At the end of the Session, the Government will be obliged to come before the people and say, 'we have not been able to do anything, because the obstructionists would not let us.' If Conservative members suppose that this will be regarded as a valid excuse, or that the failure of the Government to suppress obstruction will aid us in the next elections, they will find that they have committed a fatal and an irretrievable blunder.

It behoves us, in fact, to walk with peculiar circumspection at the present time, and as though another appeal to the people were never far distant from us. Our enemies are restless and eager, as they usually are when out of office. Great efforts are being made to place the Irish issue in a totally false light before the ignorant and the thoughtless. Thus, Lord Ripon—who has shown almost as great an anxiety to promote disunion in England as he was to excite discontent in India—stated on the 5th of January at Harrogate, that the 'real question was, were they in favour of coercion or conciliation?' That was all he had to say—or at least all that he was reported to have said—on the Irish difficulty. There could not, of course, be a more misleading or disingenuous way of presenting it. If Lord Ripon had desired to be even moderately candid, he would have confessed that coercion has been the rule with Liberal Governments, and that it was exercised in the most severe form it has ever reached by Mr. Gladstone in 1882. But although Lord Ripon's method of summing up the Irish question is not too truthful, it is none the less likely to deceive many persons who are not able to look closely into the subject for themselves. When the sympathies of an English audience are appealed to, there is usually a generous response, and if they

they are told that the Conservatives want for Ireland nothing but coercion, and that the Liberals want nothing but conciliation, they are very likely to believe it. We are unable to discover that any adequate exertions are being made on our own side to counteract these misrepresentations. Lecturers and speeches by the score are being sent into all parts of the country by the Separatists, to play upon the favourite strings of love, good-fellowship, and universal brotherhood. The Central Conservative Association in London is now most zealously and admirably managed, and the Irish Patriotic League has done most useful work. In spite of all, however, the Separatists appear to be leading the way in their exertions. No opportunity must be missed of making the public mind familiar with the truth about what is called 'Home Rule.' To very many persons, who live in centres of intellectual activity and discussion, the whole controversy may seem to be worn threadbare. But not so does it present itself to the agricultural labourer and the working man. All kinds of specious arguments are continually placed before them, and the Irish speakers who are sent down to address them bleat like so many lambs. The 'tall talk' about 'hauling down the English flag,' 'driving the Saxon out of Ireland,' and sending the landlords to the workhouse, is reserved for use across St. George's Channel. The English labourers and artisans see before them a sleek and plausible gentleman, who assures them that his affection for England is too deep for words—as indeed it is—and that all he is anxious for is to bring about a true union with Ireland—the union of hearts. There is something pleasing about all this, and if Conservatives are not on their guard, they may perchance find that the ground, in not a few instances, has been cut from under their feet, while they were congratulating each other that everything was safe.

We have, then, to keep the people well informed, and we also have to guard against any tendency towards legislation of a reactionary kind. It would be very foolish to ignore the fact, that our institutions, whether for good or for ill, now rest upon Democratic foundations. The time has gone by for argument as to the wisdom or unwisdom of this settlement; it has been made, and we must adapt ourselves to it. The Conservative party must be progressive, or it will fall to pieces, and should it fall to pieces, there is nothing between this country and revolution. That, we venture to say, is one of the forecasts which will stand the test of time. It is not merely for a party that we have to put on our armour and fight now; it is for the Constitution. We must advance with the age. Lord

Hartington

Hartington uttered a warning to the Conservative party, on the 7th of December, which was none the less worthy of attention because it was cautiously expressed. His meaning was clear enough—the Liberal Unionists could not long afford to be identified with a party which undertook to revive reactionary theories. On that point, Mr. Chamberlain is even more emphatic than Lord Hartington. A Local Government Bill, based upon a restrictive franchise, would meet with his unflinching opposition. There would at once be a split among the Liberal Unionists, even if the main body of the Conservatives held together. Is it worth while to encounter any such risks during the coming Session? Is there any necessity to produce an ambitious programme? What, as we believe, would please the people more than anything would be to see the Government exercising great firmness, combined with all due prudence, in Ireland; to see it taking some decided steps to give thorough efficiency to our army and navy, and to carry out economy in the dockyards, and in every other branch of the public service; and then to wind up the business of the Session at as early a date as possible. If it were to do no more than this, but to do that well, the country would be perfectly contented. The Government is under no pledge to introduce new legislation for Ireland. It pleases Mr. Gladstone to assume, that the present Government came into power, like his own, bound by every conceivable consideration to bring forth some scheme of Home Rule. Nothing could be further from the truth. We lay great stress upon this, because it will be found that almost as soon as the Session opens, Mr. Gladstone will, in pursuance of his own dreams and delusions, insist upon the Government producing a Home Rule Bill. Let us remember, then, how matters were left last Session. The Government applied for a Commission to enquire into Irish affairs, and Mr. Gladstone tried to extract from them an undertaking that a Bill should be introduced at the opening of the next Session. The following was the conversation:—

‘MR. GLADSTONE.—We may hope that at the beginning of the next Session of Parliament, the Government will be prepared with their plans without waiting for the report of a Royal Commission.

‘SIR M. HICKS-BEACH said he did not wish to *carry the matter further* than the point, that the appointment of the Commissions would not delay the question of local government.’—House of Commons, 24th August, 1886.

The attempt, therefore, to inveigle the Government into a position which would seriously have embarrassed it, entirely
 Vol. 164.—No. 327. U failed.

failed. But that will not deter Mr. Gladstone from coming forward to claim the fulfilment of a promise which was never given. Lord Hartington has, to some extent, anticipated this manœuvre. At the Liberal Unionist meeting, on the 7th of December, he said: 'Mr. Gladstone seems to assume, that the present Government have undertaken to compete with him in a rival scheme of Home Rule for Ireland, and that we are parties to this undertaking. But we have asked the present Government to undertake nothing of the sort. The present Government have declared, that they will not be responsible for any measure giving in any shape or form what is called Home Rule for Ireland.' This is the exact state of the case. We trust that the Government will adhere to it just as it is. That another effort must be made to settle the agrarian difficulty in Ireland we are well aware. The dual system of ownership—denounced by Mr. Gladstone in 1870, and adopted by him in 1881—must be abolished. But the Government has not time this year to prepare a scheme of this vast importance. Mr. Gladstone has given the world sufficient proof of the rashness of legislating in a hurry on questions so complex and difficult. Lord Salisbury has been, and will be, much occupied with foreign affairs. There are circumstances connected with our relations with Foreign Powers, which call for the exercise of the greatest watchfulness and caution, and to attempt to remodel the whole land system of Ireland at such a time would be rash to the last degree. The country does not expect or require it of Lord Salisbury. His efforts to preserve peace must have severely taxed all his resources, and they cannot yet be discontinued. We should hope, therefore, that the prospects of new legislation, which the Queen's Speech will open up to us, will be confined within a very narrow range.

The allusions which we have just made to the preservation of peace may, perhaps, serve to remind our readers of the absolute necessity of maintaining our army and navy—but especially our naval force—in the highest state of efficiency. It has been said that Lord Randolph Churchill was unwilling to make the necessary provision for these ends, but, although he may have objected to the estimates for the defence of our coaling stations, it was on the general principle, that we do not at present get money's worth for our money, and that economical administration has been too much lost sight of. It is not conceivable that any public man entertains a deliberate wish to weaken the British Navy, on which our existence as a nation, in more ways than one, may at any moment depend. It must never be forgotten, that our food supplies now come very largely from
foreign

foreign countries, and that, if by any disaster or miscalculation, our ports were blockaded even for a brief period, the spectre of famine would very soon be at our doors. Since it no longer pays to grow wheat in this country, large areas of land have been thrown out of cultivation; and from one-half to two-thirds of our bread-stuffs now come from abroad. A strong navy is therefore not only essential for our defence, but for our means of life. But that immense sums are squandered through incompetent management is but too certain; and the present Government would entitle itself to the gratitude of the nation, if it lessened this evil, even if it could not extinguish it altogether. The expenditure of the nation has been increasing at a rate which no nation could stand very long, especially with such a system of taxation as ours. The ordinary estimates presented in the last year of Mr. Gladstone's Administration exceeded the total outlay of the earliest year of the Crimean war. If the Conservative party cannot do better than this, it will soon forfeit its claims to public confidence. An honest and a frugal administration of the public funds—that is what the people expect from us, and it is what we are bound to give them. Generous supplies for the army and navy will not be withheld, and it is needless to say, that a public man who opposed such supplies, from a mistaken notion of parsimony, would commit a grievous fault. The nation has never been unwilling to bear any burden, however great, in order that it might be in a position to defend its coasts, seaports, and foreign possessions. It is not unwilling now, but undoubtedly there is a growing feeling of doubt as to the mode in which the money, so generously given by the taxpayers, is got rid of. The statements made in Parliament during the last two Sessions, and some of the questions which have been put, and not always satisfactorily answered, have given rise to a good deal of suspicion and distrust. There will be a great outcry before very long against the prodigality and heedlessness, which have become the settled habit in too many great Departments, no matter which party happens to be in power. We have to show, that we have done our utmost to bring into actual existence that era of 'retrenchment and reform' which Liberals have only talked about. It is one of the greatest needs of the time, but it can be met without weakening either the army or the navy.

These are the lines on which a safe, if not a very brilliant, Session may well be looked for. Such a Session may not satisfy Mr. Gladstone, but it will do something of infinitely greater moment—it will satisfy the people. They are, apparently, very much in the same frame of mind as they were in 1873—tired

of

of 'heroic legislation,' dazzling 'programmes,' and visionary schemes. They want time to recover from the latest manifestations of Mr. Gladstone's genius—time to look after their material interests, to cultivate their business connections with the Colonies, to repair, if they can, the waste and mischief occasioned by Mr. Gladstone's wars in Egypt and the Soudan. Any new experiments—even such an experiment as that with the American mails—they are disposed to regard with aversion. We are well aware that this is a free-trade country, but no one likes to see the English mails transferred to foreign steam-ship companies. The plain truth is, that the Gladstonian Administrations have rendered the whole nation thoroughly weary of the farce of 'meddling and muddling,' once so popular in Downing Street. 'Simplicity and despatch' should now be written up in those classic precincts. Lord Salisbury's patriotism, as well as his earnest desire to do what is right, cannot be denied even by the most rancorous of politicians. The great cause of the Union commands, and will obtain, the support of every man in the Conservative party. The Liberal Unionists cannot and will not desert that cause. These are the chief features of the political situation. There is nothing in them which is not calculated to increase our confidence in the signal triumph of the principles, which were ratified by the people at the last elections, and which, being based upon the highest considerations that can move any nation, must inevitably advance to still greater triumphs.

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

ART. I.—*The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley.* By Edward Dowden, LL.D., Professor of English Literature in the University of Dublin. 2 vols. London, 1886.

SHELLEY belongs to that school of poets which expressed the unrest of the Revolutionary era, its impatience of restraint, its credulous faith in human perfectibility. He was born on the 4th of August, 1792, the very day on which the National Assembly decreed the sale of all religious houses in France. An uncompromising, shattering iconoclasm, a hectic glow of excitement, and a tendency to exercise the imagination in scenes of lurid ghastliness, formed parts of his natural heritage. But in the country of his birth he was a posthumous child of the Revolution. He was reared among reactionaries; he was neither the offspring nor the favourite pupil of his foster-parents. Conflict was from the first inevitable. Shelley himself, hating control and despising discipline, accelerated the shock with the self-reliant audacity of genius. The period of reaction in which he was born seemed to him evil to the very core. He sought escape in those vaticinations of the future which have fascinated thinkers in all ages. The idealist of a new order, he led a forlorn hope to attack the citadels in which society had garnered its sanctities; he thought to carry them by assault when the defenders were on their guard. It is no wonder that he fell back wounded and bleeding.

In his iconoclastic passion, his contempt for experience, his confidence in the "sinless Eden" which was destined to spring from chaos, Shelley was essentially a revolutionary poet. The present world seemed to him withered and decrepit; its vigour enfeebled by age, its vision dimmed by time, its senses ice-bound by the frost of custom. All that was must be swept away, to make room for all that was to come. The existing conditions of the real world excited in him no interest, but

only a passionate desire for their absolute obliteration. No considerations for others diverted him a hair's-breadth from his arrowy course; he saw nothing between himself and his mark; his mind possesses the thin edge and sheer surface of fanaticism; he has the logical sincerity of a St. Just or a Cimaroudain. His attitude offers a striking contrast to that of Byron: it also affords an explanation of the different treatment, which contemporaries dealt out to the two poets. Byron shocked the moral sense of society by his life; he scoffed, as a sardonic rebel, against religious creeds. But he expressed no desire to destroy to the ground the social and political fabric, and he half believed the faith at which he sneered. He was devoid of Shelley's optimism: he acknowledged no mission to reform the world; he felt no blind belief in the new law of Liberty and Love.

Shelley is in fact the poet of progress and of democracy, the lineal ancestor of Victor Hugo, and of Walt Whitman. But he differs essentially from his successors. He is less a student of the human mind than Hugo; unlike Whitman, he rather vitalizes abstractions than links together realities. He has none of the theatrical extravagance of the Frenchman, the savage animalism of the American, the earthly materialism of his own English disciples. Not only is he more distant and more athermal: he is also more universal than any of his school. Neither France nor America is to regenerate the world; nations as well as individuals are blended in the comprehensiveness of his gaze. The remoteness and universality of his idealism destroyed his immediate influence; but half a century later his words retain the trumpet-note of unfulfilled and distant prophecy.

The attitude in which Shelley stands towards the past, the present, and the future, explains the unreasoning neglect of his poetic genius during his life, as well as the indiscriminating eulogy which is now lavished upon his name by those who idolize him not merely as their poet, but as their political, ethical, and religious prophet. Political feeling once denied him his genius; it now denies his faults. His creed, in itself, possesses but little value: it is sophistical, shallow, credulous, chaotic; it is marred by misrepresentations of religion and of history, by reckless defiance of the highest conventions of human society which have proved the nursing mothers of our purest instincts. He ignored the strength of political and social institutions; he overlooked the connection of the present with the past; he was blind to the value for good and evil of the ancestral heritage which every generation transmits, augmented

mented or impaired, to the generation which succeeds. But his vision of the future shames the actualities of the present; it exhibits an ideal goal of progress

‘such as vision
Builds from the purple crags and silver towers
Of battlemented cloud, as in derision
Of kingliest masonry.’

Both as a man and as a poet Shelley affords a fascinating subject to the biographer. The life of an individual attracts his fellows in proportion as its circumstances have been difficult or painful. From this point of view Shelley always commands our pity, even when he least arouses our sympathies. Apart from his genius, he claims a record of his career, because he devoted his powers to what he considered to be the best interests of mankind. He deserves a study of his character, partly because of the strange complexities of his mental and moral constitution, partly because impressions of his fine delicate mind and high-strung nature are too often struck from the broad black lines in which the salient features of his romantic career have been presented. In one sense he is his own best biographer. Though he has left many obscure, and still inexplicable, allusions to the facts of his external life, he has written himself clearly and unmistakably into his works. His poems are a record, more or less veiled, of his life, character, and thoughts; like fleecy clouds, they catch the varying tints of his mind as it rises in hope or sets in despair. Sometimes he delineates himself by the direct process of describing his own feelings; sometimes he conveys the same result more unconsciously by impressing a poem with a vivid idea of his intense simple being. Even longer works which, like the ‘Cenci,’ seem more remote from personal presentment, reflect the character of their author in the absolute surrender of the actors to one overmastering passion; it is even possible that he saw himself in Beatrice engaged in a struggle against the tyranny, oppression, and icy cynicism, which he associated with old age or the old world.

Many have attempted, but none have really achieved, the task of writing Shelley’s biography. Among those who knew him in his lifetime, Mrs. Shelley, Hogg, Medwin, Trelawney, Peacock, Leigh Hunt, his sister, and his school-fellows, have recorded their impressions of his character or dealt with portions of his career. Of those who were not his contemporaries, Lady Shelley, Middleton, Barnett Smith, MacCarthy, Symonds, Garnett, Rossetti, and Jeaffreson, have occupied themselves

with his life as a whole or in part. His poetry inspired the artistic faculties of Noel Paton; it has found editors in Mrs. Shelley, Rossetti, Forman, and Lowell; portions have been translated into Italian, French, and German. His life and works have been the subject of monographs and innumerable articles.

It is necessary to bear in mind the mass that has been written respecting Shelley, the number of unprofitable controversies to which his writings have given rise, the veil of truth interwoven with fiction which obscures so many of his actions. In the abundance of the old and new material which was placed at his disposal lay Professor Dowden's chief difficulty, and herein lies one great cause of his comparative failure. Had he written *Shelley's Life* as if it had never been written before, he would have produced a more dramatic biography. The two bulky volumes, into which his labour of love is condensed, show the industry which accumulates details, the delicate tact which is indispensable for any one who deals minutely with *Shelley's Life*, the artistic taste and scholarly workmanship that are required for the lucid arrangement of facts. But he is everywhere hampered by his predecessors; he cannot lose sight of the hostile attacks which have been made upon the memory of the poet. He is also embarrassed by the abundance of the new material which has been placed at his disposal. It may be that the curiosity of the age demands to know every petty incident in the daily life of genius. To us trivial points do not cease to be paltry because the individual with whom they are connected is great. Those who differ from us on this point, and they are many, have cause to be grateful to Professor Dowden. He has told all that can be known about Shelley; he has spared no pains to be exhaustive and accurate; he has revealed him to the world from top to toe. But he has rather made an invaluable addition to a Shelley literature, than painted a picture of the living poet. He has sacrificed dramatic presentation to laborious minuteness of detail; he has given an analysis, which cannot be regarded as final, so long as the documents, on which it is based, are unpublished. The synthesis, which his rare gift of sympathetic insight peculiarly qualifies him to effect, is never even attempted.

But graver defects exist in Professor Dowden's '*Life of Shelley*' than any want of finality or failure in dramatic presentation. Professor Dowden cultivates a lightness of touch, which does not compensate for the want of firmness of grip. He throughout refuses to emphasize with adequate strength the weak points of Shelley's moral nature. He is undoubtedly

right

right in relegating to the background the poet's eccentricities, for they have hitherto occupied a wholly disproportionate space. For the first time these surface peculiarities occupy their proper position. So, again, he is amply justified in laying most stress on the nobility of Shelley's character, for the higher elements of his nature altogether preponderate over the lower. But, while the biographer calls attention to the poet's virtues, he only tacitly condemns his faults. The volume abounds with illustrations of Shelley's weaknesses; his confirmed habit of telling white lies; the vibration of his passions from violent love to equally violent hatred; the bravado of his attacks upon religion or natural instincts; his incapacity for self-control, which showed itself in fits of helpless rage on trivial occasions; his impatience of every feeling which did not at once explain itself to his peculiar temperament. These defects are not omitted, but they are ignored. A false impression is produced on all who do not read the volumes with care. They cannot fail to see the virtues, because they are printed in capitals; they may pass by the faults, because for them the biographer uses the smallest possible type.

If this were all, Professor Dowden might be pardoned the besetting sin of an official biographer. But it is not all. In dealing with Shelley's desertion of his first wife, Professor Dowden commits an unjustifiable breach of the golden rule of advocacy. He vindicates Shelley by casting a slur upon Harriet Westbrook. He has not resisted the influence of his surroundings. He has been brought into close contact with Shelley's surviving relatives, whose enthusiasm in defence of the poet is as warm as it is, if we may venture to say so, becoming. But, while we sympathize with Professor Dowden's position, he ought, in our opinion, to have thrown down his pen and refused to continue his task sooner than insinuate charges of immorality, charges which he himself admits are unverified and unverifiable, against a most unhappy and ill-treated woman.

But for one circumstance we should rest content with this repudiation of Professor Dowden's moral paradoxes, for we have no desire to linger over the errors of a man like Shelley, whose nature was loveable, and for whose genius we feel the keenest admiration. The indirect consequence of Professor Dowden's advocacy may be infinitely mischievous, if it is allowed to pass unchallenged. The modern cult of Shelley refuses to be satisfied with the most enthusiastic appreciation of his lyric genius. He is borne aloft on a rising tide of materialism and anti-religionism. Not content to claim for
their

their hero lofty aspirations and generous impulses, the possession of which every one concedes to Shelley, his worshippers endow their idol with the highest moral, political, and religious wisdom. He is not only their poet, but their prophet and priest, their saint and martyr. It is the implied premiss with a certain school of writers, that speculative opinions do not affect moral tone or conduct. Shelley acted throughout his life in a spirit of hostility towards the forms, if not the spirit, of religion; scepticism was in his mind intimately connected with 'anti-matrimonialism, as if,' we quote his own words, 'religion and marriage began their course together.' If Shelley was betrayed by his speculative opinions into cruel and treacherous actions, the implied premiss to which we have before alluded is so far negated. It therefore becomes essential that Shelley's moral character should be at all hazards vindicated. Professor Dowden's defence of Shelley is the more dangerous, because he is entirely unbiassed by any such consideration. It is as a protest against the use to which these volumes may be turned, a protest against the theory that moral conduct is uninfluenced by speculative opinions, or that impulse is necessarily a divine authority; as a protest, finally, against the absurd claims which are so loudly made in support of Shelley's deep ethical wisdom, that we engage in a discussion for which we have no personal inclination, and which must, to some extent, be repulsive to our readers.

The following pages fall into two main divisions. In the first part we propose to test the soundness of Shelley's moral principles, by a reference to his relations with his sister Elizabeth in 1811; to gauge his capacity for forming a judgment upon facts by a brief discussion of those mysterious visions and encounters, which Professor Dowden treats as historic occurrences, but which we regard as hallucinations; and lastly, to examine the justification which is put forward, to excuse his conduct towards Harriet Westbrook. In the second part we shall venture to present our own conception of Shelley's moral and mental character, and to illustrate both from his poetical works.

Early in 1811, Shelley's prospects of marriage with his cousin Harriet Grove were entirely destroyed. 'She is gone!' he writes to Hogg on the 6th of January, 'she is lost to me ever; for ever!' He repeats the same language five days later, and emphasizes the utter hopelessness of his love by a poetical anticipation of Miss Grove's marriage 'to a clod of earth;' she was as entirely lost to him as if she was already married. The blow was heavy; it was followed two months later by his expulsion from Oxford. His letters from January to August 1811,

1811, as printed in Hogg's Life, reveal the perturbation of his mind under these two successive shocks. During this period he appears to have entertained the idea of a union between himself and his own sister Elizabeth. It is probable that he allowed himself to conceive a passion for the ideal being of divine perfection into which his sister was transfigured by his imagination; it was at first not 'the person, the embodied identity,' not Elizabeth, whom he adored, but the vision of intellectual beauty clothed in the accidents of her humanity. However this may have been at the outset, it is extremely difficult to read his letter of July 4th to Hogg in conjunction with his previous correspondence,* without coming to the conclusion, that Shelley ardently desired a union, if possible without marriage, between himself and his sister. The following is the important passage of the letter of the 4th of July, 1811.

* Field Place, July 4, 1811.

'How, then, do I still persist in —. I own it; it was the fondest wish of my heart, and bitterly was I disappointed at its annihilation. I own it: *I desired, eagerly desired to see myself and her irrevocably united by the rites of the Church, but where the high priest would have been Love; I pictured to myself Elysium in beholding my only perfect one daring the vain world, smiling at its silly forms, setting an example of perfection to an universe.*† I do not estimate, as you know, from relationship: I am cool, I hope. I should now grieve to see myself sacrificed, when there may exist a less imperfect being, and I might be perhaps considered as not wholly unworthy of her.'—Hogg, 'Life,' vol. i. p. 411.

If we are to suppose that insanity did not, throughout Shelley's life, hang suspended over him by a single hair,—if we are to believe that he, as the model of ethical wisdom, was in a marked degree accountable for all his actions, what construction can be placed upon this extraordinary letter? The date proves that the language of passion cannot refer to Harriet Grove or to Harriet Westbrook. The only escape from the conclusion which we have drawn is to plead the slovenly editorship of Hogg, to impugn not only his chronological accuracy but his textual and substantial fidelity. This is the desperate refuge of Mr. Rossetti and of Mr. Symonds.

Mr. Rossetti was struck by the obvious meaning of the phrases contained in the letter of July 4th. In his memoir,‡ he says:—

* Especially the following letters in vol. i. of Hogg's 'Life':—April 26th (p. 262); April 28th (p. 350); May 2nd (p. 367); May 21st (p. 380); June 2nd (p. 394); June 21st (p. 405); June 23rd (p. 409).

† The italics are ours.

‡ Note, p. lv. of 1st Edit., p. 28 of 2nd Edit.

'A very

'A very grave conjecture might be, and has been, built upon its terms; but I suspect that, owing to Hogg's slovenly editorship, there is a serious misprint in it, and shall leave it without comment.'

By the side of this note is a second, appended to a reference on the same page, which is made to Shelley's letters written to Hogg from Cwm Elan in the course of the same month:—

'Lady Shelley ("Shelley Memorials," p. 22) refers to two of these letters, and says she is "not able to guarantee their authority." No doubt Lady Shelley speaks advisedly; but a biographer who knows nothing to the contrary must accept as genuine letters printed by Hogg as having been addressed to himself, and by himself received at the date of the transaction.'

With this second note we fully agree. Mr. Rossetti, with admirable candour, prints the answer by the side of the defence.

Mr. Symonds* appears to interpret the letters in question as we and Mr. Rossetti have read them:—

'The letters written to Hogg at this period (vol. i. pp. 387-418) are exceedingly important and interesting, revealing as they do the perturbation of his feelings and the almost morbid excitement of his mind. But they are, unluckily, so badly edited, whether designedly or by accident, that it would be dangerous to draw minute conclusions from them. As they stand, they raise injurious suspicions, which can only be set at rest by a proper assignment of dates and explanations.'

In the two next paragraphs, relying almost entirely on the evidence of these same letters, Mr. Symonds finds it to be clear

'firstly, that Shelley was not deeply in love with Harriett when he eloped with her; secondly, that he was not prepared for the step; thirdly, that she induced him to take it; and fourthly, that he took it under a strong impression of her having been ill-treated.'

Thus the letters which are too badly edited to support minute conclusions, are made the nice tests of fine degrees of love, the delicate balances in which to weigh motives and impressions.

Professor Dowden skates lightly over the thin ice. He treats the series of letters as if they referred throughout to Shelley's project of a union between his sister and his friend. He quotes from most of the correspondence, with the exception of the letter of July 4th. Even if his treatment of the letters could be accepted as satisfactory—and it must be remembered that the unnoticed letter of July 4th cuts away the ground from under him,—he confers a doubtful benefit upon his client. He places Shelley in the position of an elder brother seeking to prostitute his sister to his friend. Like Mr. Rossetti and Mr. Symonds,

* 'Life of Shelley,' p. 47.

Professor Dowden quotes repeatedly and unreservedly from Hogg's letters. He nowhere discredits their genuineness; but everywhere impliedly confirms their substantial accuracy. The inference to be drawn from his use of them is the same as that which must be deduced from the habitual reliance by Mr. Rossetti and Mr. Symonds upon their authority. All three writers treat the correspondence as genuine. It is indeed impossible to conceive any motive for garbling the letters in question. Hogg might very well have omitted them altogether. Were he an utterly unscrupulous editor, he would have been, in this instance, far more likely to suppress, than to fabricate, evidence of a scheme at once so wild and so repulsive.

The interpretation which we have placed upon the letters receives some collateral confirmation from Shelley's poetry. Both 'The Revolt of Islam' and 'Rosalind and Helen,' are full of autobiographical matter; both prove at least as much as this, that Shelley contemplated the union of a brother and a sister without repugnance. The original plot of 'Laon and Cythna' (re-issued as 'The Revolt of Islam') turned upon such an union of a brother and a sister. In referring to this incident in his Preface, Shelley is entitled to the benefit of his own note. 'The sentiments connected with and characteristic of this circumstance have no personal reference to the writer.' It is at least a general truth which the cynical French proverb expresses, that the self-excuser is the self-accuser. Again, in 'Rosalind and Helen,' 'the lone and silent spot' in which the two women meet is haunted by the spectres of a brother and sister who there resigned themselves 'to one another body and soul.' So also Rosalind's unhappy wedded life sprang from her interrupted marriage with the brother to whom, in ignorance of their relationship, she was about to be united.

Among the many problems of Shelley's life none is more singular than the number of mysterious episodes which it contains. Some writers treat his strange experiences as historical occurrences, others as hallucinations. Professor Dowden accepts them, though apparently with some misgivings, as genuine incidents; we regard them as delusions.

A child's mind is singularly powerful in its conceptive and dramatic faculty. This gift of the imagination, in which men of genius resemble children, Shelley possessed to a degree, which is hardly consistent with perfect soundness of mind. He never lost the freshness of the child's sight which he carried in his breast. So habitual was his exercise of this imaginative power, that it, to a certain degree, weakens his testimony in matters of fact. It was accompanied by a disregard for truthfulness

fulness in small matters. The circumstantial, but false, account which Shelley, as a child, gave of his visit to some neighbours is an early instance of this sportive invention. Numerous instances occur in Professor Dowden's volumes of his lifelong habit of petty fibbing. It is difficult, if not impossible, to draw the line where self-deception began and ended. While Shelley fed his brain on morbid horrors, he realized them to himself so intensely that they made a part of his very existence. So also he elaborated the actions, which would naturally result from any state of mind through which he passed, composed appropriate scenes for their occurrence, and finally, as his imagination overpowered his memory, believed that he had actually enacted the part which, given the time and the occasion, he would have assumed. These are the explanations of his statements, that he had more than once poisoned himself; that he was sent away from Eton for sticking a knife through the hand of a school-fellow or twice suffered expulsion for the incautious dissemination of the principles of 'Political Justice'; that he had published 'Zastrozzi' and 'St. Irvyne' before he was seventeen; that his father intended to ship him off abroad, and then by 'process of outlawry' devolve the estates upon his younger brother; that he, a beardless boy, braved with his eloquence the common room at University.

His dreams and visions afford a halfway house towards the vivid realization of his reading or of his imaginary conduct. As he walked with Williams on the terrace above the sea at Lerici, he saw, as plainly as he saw his companion, 'a naked child rise from the surf and clap its hands as in joy, smiling at him.' But this vision was only the effect upon his excited nerves of the death of Allegra. Again, at Casa Magni he saw his own phantasm or double, which vanished with the words 'Siete soddisfatto.' Medwin believes that this dream was founded on a supposed play of Calderon's, called 'El Embozado ó el encapotado.' Professor Dowden could find no trace of such a play. We have little doubt that the incident is founded on a play which had profoundly impressed Shelley, the 'El Purgatorio de San Patricio.'* In act ii. scene 2, a muffled figure appears

* Shelley refers in all probability to a passage from this play when he speaks of his one conscious plagiarism in 'the Cenci.' Beatrice [act iii. scene 1] describes the ravine appointed for her father's murder and the overhanging rock,

'With the agony
With which it clings seems slowly coming down.'

This transference of feeling to the rock seems to be taken from the 'El Purgatorio,' where Polonia says (we quote MacCarthy's version)—

'See

appears to Enius and beckons him to follow. Enius tears the cloak from the figure and reveals a skeleton. Horror-struck he exclaims, 'Who art thou?' And the figure answers:—

'Not know thyself;
This is thy most faithful portrait;
I, alas! am Luis Enius.'

It is but a short step from such dramatic realization of thoughts which greatly occupied his mind to more complete hallucinations. As a boy, Shelley believed that his father intended to send him to a madhouse; he despatched an express to Dr. Lind who, 'by his authority, his expostulations, and his menaces, turned Sir Timothy from his purpose.' Shelley was at the time recovering from fever: and Hogg regards as a delusion of the boy's fevered brain an episode which Professor Dowden believes to be a fact. It is worth noticing that Shelley's mind was at the time full of his novel of 'Zastrozzi,' in which Verezzi is chained to a rock in a dismal dungeon and afterwards imprisoned in a lonely cottage on a desolate heath. So again in the 'Revolt of Islam,' Laon's naked body is chained to a rock with links of brass, and in his grated cage his brain totters on the verge of madness. In another poem of the same date, 'Rosalind and Helen,' Lionel is borne in chains to a dreary tower. At this moment, when these imaginary incidents are freshly stamped upon his brain, a Mr. Williams arrives to warn Shelley of his father's intention to confine him in a madhouse. The inference generally drawn from the narration of an incident in a poem is that it is founded on fact. Our theory is that Shelley often related as facts the imaginary incidents of a work of fiction. It is thus that we explain, without impugning Shelley's truthfulness in matters of importance, his encounters with mysterious braves. Mr. Hall Caine, in the 'Academy' for the 4th of December, 1886, gives strong reasons, based on a local knowledge of the spot, for refusing to believe in the existence of the Keswick ruffian. The episode at Tanyrallt seems to us equally a coinage of his excited brain. Shelley's natural tendency to confound the creations of his imagination with the facts of his real life may have been in both instances stimulated by opium. Be that as it may, he always realized his reading to his imagination with extraordinary vividness. 'Thalaba' was one of Shelley's favourite poems.

'See ye not here this rock some power secureth,
That grasps with awful toil the hillside brown,
And with the very anguish it endureth
Age after age seems slowly coming down.'

'Thalaba'

'Thalaba' suggested the rhythm of 'Queen Mab;' Thalaba and the Damsel, like Laon and Cythna, voyage in a boat; from 'Thalaba,' Shelley took the name Maimuma, which he gave to Mrs. Boinville. Medwin's account of the alleged encounter, an account derived from Shelley himself, closely resembles a scene in 'Thalaba.' The ruffian was 'short and powerful.' 'Shelley, though slightly built, was tall, and, at that time, strong and muscular. They were no unequal match. It was a contest between mind and matter.' The struggle between Mohareb and young Thalaba is thus described:—

'Sinewy and strong of limb, Mohareb was
Broad shouldered, and his joints
Knit firm, and in the strife
Of danger practised well.
Time had not yet matured young Thalaba;
But now the enthusiast mind,
The inspiration of his soul,
Pour'd vigour like the strength
Of madness through his frame.
Mohareb reels before him! he right on
With knee, with breast, with arm,
Presses the staggering foe.'

If we have carried the reader with us in our construction of Shelley's letter to Hogg and of his mental constitution, the result is this. Shelley's moral character was either utterly unformed, or so perverted and diseased by his lawless theories of the relations of the sexes, that he only regarded ties of relationship as accidents, and treated in the light of vulgar prejudices the natural instincts that separate, while they unite, a brother and a sister. He had no reverence for truth in the smaller matters of life; his habit of petty fibbing may be called a foible, but he told white lies without scruple to avoid inconveniences of social intercourse, and urged others to follow the example of his habitual practice. He was so prone to wild delusions that his mind perpetually hovered on the verge of absolute insanity; he confused the facts of his real life with the facts of his imagination; he possessed a dramatic faculty which was always a ready instrument of self-deception. It is not enough to say, as Professor Dowden says, that the judgment of such a man is peculiarly liable to error. When his passions were aroused he was incapable of forming a judgment; his suspicions were not evidence; he was prepared to confound a pretext with a justification; his beliefs bore no more solid relation to adequate grounds of belief than do the whims of a child. He knew no creed which forbade him to sacrifice impulse to duty; he recognized

recognized no external law of right and wrong; he acknowledged no absolute standard by which to test the reality of moral distinctions. He possibly did believe that Harriet had been unfaithful to him. But unless his belief rested on reasonable grounds, his strong persuasion in the direction of his wishes affords no adequate justification for his conduct.

What then is the fresh evidence which is adduced to establish reasonable grounds for Shelley's conduct towards Harriet Westbrook? Desertion by a husband can only be justified by the wife's immorality. This is the excuse, which Professor Dowden at one moment puts forward, at another withdraws; this is the explanation which he alternately accepts and disclaims. Finally, he may be taken to say that, if Harriet was innocent, a matter which is open to doubt, Shelley believed that she was guilty. The new authorities on which Professor Dowden relies for this halting defence are of little value. The judges of Harriet's alleged misconduct are Hogg, Mary, and Godwin. Each of these witnesses is tainted. Hogg, if we are to believe Professor Dowden, was Harriet's would-be seducer; Mary was the last person in the world who could be expected to judge Harriet dispassionately; Godwin was the father of Harriet's supplanter. Their evidence, such as it is, is mere scandal. Hogg says nothing against Harriet's moral character; he only insinuates that she had developed a taste for finery, and preferred millinery to idealism. Godwin and Mary go further, but they merely make assertions; they offer no details; they produce no proof in support of the charge. Mary, in all probability, relied on no other evidence than the statements of her husband, and his suspicions or beliefs are, as we venture to think, absolutely worthless. There remains Godwin's 'unquestionable,' but anonymous, 'authority,' communicated in 1817, that 'the late Mrs. Shelley has turned out to be a woman of great levity.' No one knows who or what was the original authority for this assertion; if Trelawney is to be believed, the statement did not proceed from any of the intimate friends of Shelley and his first wife. Professor Dowden, without definitely accepting the allegation, supports it by laying stress on the kindly feeling and accurate habits of mind and speech of Godwin. Our own opinion of Godwin's trustworthiness is diametrically opposed to that of Professor Dowden, and no more contemptible figure appears in the biography than the philosophical Pecksniff, who sponged upon his son-in-law amid windy protestations of his own moral dignity and self-respect. As a witness Godwin's bias is obvious; he had the strongest motive for attaching to a malicious innuendo the definiteness of a specific and authenticated

ticated charge. Against the vague hints and unsupported assertions of three tainted witnesses must be set Peacock's emphatic declaration of his belief in Harriet's innocence; 'I feel it due to the memory of Harriet to state my most decided conviction, that her conduct as a wife was as pure, as true, as absolutely faultless, as that of any who for such conduct are held most in honour.' This belief, as Trelawney states, was shared 'by the few friends who knew both Shelley and his wife,' and it is a belief which Thornton Hunt endorses with all the advantage of a knowledge of his father's opinions on the subject. 'No one who was not a rash partizan would assert,' says Professor Dowden, 'that Harriet was not innocent.' Who but a partizan, we may ask, would so reverse the natural inference as to hint that she was guilty?

Professor Dowden states without hesitation that, in May 1814, Harriet had assumed an attitude of 'hard alienation towards her husband.' For this statement he mainly relies upon a poem of Shelley's own. We readily admit that Harriet was not the most fitting companion for life that Shelley could have chosen. She could not follow her husband's flights through the region of the unconditioned. Many men might not have wished their wives to accompany them in these excursions. But Shelley yearned for companionship; he was not stable enough to be self-sufficient; he could not tread alone 'the paths of high intent.' It was an old story. The shoe was a pretty little shoe, but the foot was too big for it. One thing is absolutely certain, that Shelley, a few weeks after Harriet's supposed alienation, had ceased to love his wife. Even if Harriet's tenderness towards her husband had really slackened, it is impossible to read her touching letter in July without feeling that Shelley might at any moment have won back her full affections. But he was not the man to seek to revive in himself, much less in another, an emotion which he had once ceased to feel or create. Harriet's letter is addressed to Hookham the publisher. She asks him to give

'the enclosed to Mr. Shelley. I would not trouble you, but it is now four days since I have heard from him, which to me is an age. Will you write by return of post, and tell me what has become of him, as I always fancy something dreadful has happened if I do not hear from him. If you tell me that he is well, I shall not come to London: but if I do not hear from you or him, I shall certainly come, as I cannot endure this dreadful state of suspense.'

'But,' comments Professor Dowden, 'the time to retrace her steps was now past. Her friend, her guardian, Shelley might still be, but never again her husband. From an assurance that she had ceased to love

love him, Shelley had passed on to a conviction that she had given her heart to another, and had linked her life to his.'

No one is better aware than Professor Dowden how utterly worthless were Shelley's convictions at a moment when he was labouring, as Peacock says, under a 'sudden, violent, irresistible passion.' Shelley already loved Mary Godwin; already another's lips touched his 'tremblingly;' already the 'dark eyes' of another soothed his 'dream of pain.' We read Professor Dowden's commentary with astonishment, an astonishment which rises to indignation when we reach his account of Harriet's death.

It is, we think, impossible to weigh the evidence impartially, and form any other conclusion, than that the sole reason of Shelley's desertion of his wife was his passionate love for Mary. In his interview with Peacock at the time, he gave no hint of any suspicion of his wife's infidelity. The testimony of Peacock, a friend of both parties, outweighs all Professor Dowden's suppositions, and deserves to be put once more upon record:—

'Shelley might well have said, after first seeing Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, "*Ut vidi, ut perii.*" Nothing I ever heard in tale or history could present a more striking image of a sudden, violent, irresistible, uncontrollable passion, than that under which I found him labouring when, at his request, I went up from the country to call on him in London. Between his old feelings towards Harriet, *from whom he was not then separated*, and his new passion for Mary, he showed in his looks, in his gesture, in his speech, the state of a mind, "suffering, like a little kingdom, the nature of an insurrection." His eyes were bloodshot, his hair and dress disordered. He caught up a bottle of laudanum, and said, "I never part from this." . . . Again, he said more calmly, "Every one who knows me must know that the partner of my life should be one who can feel poetry and understand philosophy. Harriet is a noble animal, but she can do neither." I said, "It always appeared to me that you were very fond of Harriet." Without affirming or denying this, he answered, "But you did not know how I hated her sister."

'The term "noble animal" he applied to his wife, in conversation with another friend now living, intimating that the nobleness which he thus ascribed to her would incline her to acquiesce in the inevitable transfer of his affections to their new shrine. She did not so acquiesce, and he cut the Gordian knot of the difficulty by leaving England with Miss Godwin on the 28th of July, 1814.

'Shortly after this I received a letter from Harriet, wishing to see me. I called on her at her father's house in Chapel Street, Grosvenor Square. She then gave me her account of the transaction, which decidedly contradicted the supposition of anything like separation by mutual consent.'—'Peacock's Works,' vol. iii. pp. 417, 418.

Professor

Professor Dowden remarks upon this statement, 'it is evident that Shelley did not confide to Peacock the complete story of his alienation from Harriet.' Our own opinion is, that Shelley's story of Harriet's infidelity affords an instance of his partial self-deception, which he did not venture to 'confide to Peacock,' who knew too well all the facts of the case to give the slightest credence to such a charge. But even Shelley's persuasion of Harriet's guilt appears to us immaterial as a justification of his desertion of his wife. It is, however, important in reference to his conduct towards Mary and his subsequent relations with Harriet. Either he did, or he did not, believe his wife's infidelity. If he did not believe it, no language is strong enough to condemn his treachery, in using such an argument to overcome Mary's scruples. If he did believe it, what is to be thought of the ethics of a man, who makes the woman he loves his mistress, when he might make her his wife? of the mental state of this dishonoured husband, who asks his frail wife to become the companion of the child with whom he had fled? of the delicacy of this injured husband who could stoop to borrow money of the wife who had defiled his bed? It was on the extraordinary character of Shelley's subsequent relations with Harriet that Mr. Garnett based his theory, that the husband and wife separated by mutual consent. Against this theory must now be set, not only the express denial of Harriet, but the equally express contradiction of Mary Shelley.* It is, in fact, abandoned by Professor Dowden. Acquiescence on the part of Harriet in an accomplished fact there probably was, but this falls far short of consent. If then there was no separation by consent, and if he is to be held responsible for his actions, and if any certain inferences can be drawn from his conduct, his subsequent relations with Harriet incontestably prove that Shelley did not believe in his wife's guilt.

For some months after Shelley's return from the Continent with Mary, he corresponded with, visited, and even borrowed money from Harriet. Then she disappeared from his sight. He heard nothing more of her till she was found drowned in the Serpentine on the 10th of December, 1816. Professor Dowden states, but without alleging a tittle of evidence to support his assertion, and admitting in the next page that he can neither verify nor disprove the statement, that, after the separation, Harriet Westbrook 'wandered from the paths of upright living.' He takes advantage of this story elaborately to excuse

* "They" (Harriet and Shelley) "did not part by mutual consent, and Shelley's justification, to me obvious, rests on other grounds."—Mrs. Shelley to Leigh Hunt, Dec. 28, 1825 (quoted by Prof. Dowden, vol. i. p. 426).

Shelley of any share in her death. He admits that Shelley was remotely 'an influence of perilous power,' but otherwise he acquits him of any direct blame. To repeat a charge of immorality, admittedly incapable of proof, is unworthy of Professor Dowden's reputation; to employ this unsubstantiated suggestion as a screen for Shelley, appears to us as unsound in argument as it is in morality. Is not the man something more than 'a perilous influence,' who carries off a child of sixteen from her home, undermines her creed, unsettles her principles, allows her to continue in the society of her would-be seducer, who yet remained her husband's friend, abandons her for a woman younger and cleverer than herself, deserts her to be the prey of the resentment born of wounded pride, leaves her in the charge of a sister whom Shelley himself described as a 'miserable wretch—a blind and loathsome worm that cannot see to sting?' Is not the man who thus acts towards his wife directly responsible for her subsequent conduct? If, after her desertion, Harriet became the frailest of the frail, it is Shelley's hand which forged link after link in the disastrous chain of consequences that led to her alleged moral ruin and her unhappy suicide. He strove hard to excuse himself of all blame for Harriet's death. He said, with the bravado of a man who endeavours to hide remorse under an affectation of unconcern, that Fanny Imlay's suicide caused him keener pain than that of his wife. But he shows his truer self in the lines which he wrote the following year, lines in which it is difficult not to recognize a distinct allusion to this tragic event:—

'That time is dead for ever, child,
Drowned, frozen, dead for ever!
We look on the past;
And stare aghast
At the spectres, wailing, pale and ghast,
Of hopes which thou and I beguiled
To death on life's dark river.'

To what other occurrence in Shelley's life can we refer the lines which occur in the portrait of himself, painted by his own hand, in 'Adonais'?

'Sad Urania scanned
The Stranger's mien, and murmured: "Who art thou?"
He answered not, but with a sudden hand
Made bare his branded and ensanguined brow,
Which was like Cain's or Christ's. Oh! that it should be so!'

Where could moralists ask for a sterner satire on the divine authority of impulse than the cruel actions into which the gentle
Vol. 164.—No. 328. Y tender-

tender-hearted poet was hurried? or what more impressive refutation in real life could they demand of his antinomian principles of Free Love than the many tragedies with which his name is connected? As a boy, Shelley had been fascinated by wild theories upon marriage. He clung to his crude philosophy, though at every turn it was dishonoured by experience, from a mistaken feeling of intellectual pride. 'Love withers under constraint: it is free;' 'constancy is no virtue in itself;' 'chastity is a monkish and evangelical superstition;' 'a husband and wife ought to continue so long united as they love each other.' Such were the shallow principles which he or his teachers promulgated. Their words came home to roost. Despair at the consequences of lawless love impelled Mary Wollstonecraft to attempt her own death; the same pernicious views on marriage drove Fanny Imlay and Harriet Westbrook to commit suicide. Jane Clairmont's lifelong shame was indirectly due to the lawless example of Shelley's conduct. From the same cause sprang the loss of his children, his exile, his isolation, and the slanders which were bred by the equivocal position of Claire in his house. The same selfish system made his first home 'sad and silent,' and his second 'cold'; it took from him, as he sang in his dejection at Naples, not only fame but love; it led him to speak in 1821 of marriage as

'life's great cheat—a thing
Bitter to taste, sweet to imagining.'

Thus throughout his career he reaped a bitter harvest of results from his fickle and undisciplined life. It is true that he never recognized any guilt in his self-styled 'errors,' and that he believed his conduct to be actuated by the purest principles. A willing martyr to the truth of his convictions, he placidly ignored the victims who were sacrificed to his generous libertinism.

It is impossible so to tamper with fundamental principles of morality as to plead that they exist for mediocrity, but not for genius. If Shelley was a consummate teacher of religious, political, and ethical philosophy, then, as the apostle of incest, adultery, and desertion, his life and principles merit the strongest reprobation. An alternative exists, which we prefer to embrace.

Our view of Shelley's character is based on the entire surrender of all his claims to consummate ethical, religious, or political wisdom. Of morals or religion in their relation to practical life he had never mastered even the rudiments. So far from being a teacher in these subjects, he had, at the time of his death, but just become a pupil. Not only was his moral sense

unformed,

unformed, but his mind was so peculiarly constituted, or so disordered, that, while he remained legally responsible for all his actions, he repeatedly tottered on the verge of insanity. If this view be admitted, the world cannot pass judgment upon Shelley in accordance with its ordinary standards of right and wrong.

Shelley, as a child, was the leader of his sisters in their games; their playful companion, but never their tyrant. They shared his terror and delight in the old grey alchemist who haunted the garret of Field Place, the great snake that hid in the gardens, the great tortoise which gambolled in Warnham Lake. Now breaking out into wild freaks of high animal spirits, now prying with wide-eyed wonder into the mysteries of the supernatural world—at one time experimenting in the hidden marvels of science, at another wandering by night to contemplate in silent musing the mysteries of the moon and of the stars—Shelley passed from childhood into boyhood without any of that discipline or companionship which prepares the child for school. His life at Sion House and Eton was unhappy. He was ill-fitted for the rough world into which he was plunged; intercourse with his contemporaries did not develop, but rather checked his growth. His fresh, girlish complexion; his large blue eyes, now dreamily soft, now brilliant with excitement; his shy, innocent, half-bewildered expression; his trance-like abstractions; his sudden paroxysms of fury; his careless dress, marked out 'mad Shelley' as the victim of the petty tyrannies which boys of rougher natures never encounter, or at once forget. On Shelley they left a profound and ineffaceable impression. He shrank back more and more into himself.

Isolated from his school-fellows, neglected by his teachers, misunderstood by his parents, Shelley withdrew into the ideal world which he created for himself. Already the invisible fascinated his imagination. He fed his taste for the marvellous on tales of the Romantic School. A fearless questioner, he was irresistibly impelled to lift the painted veil of life. Of all his studies Science alone stirred his enthusiasm; the microscope enlarged the boundaries of known existence; chemistry placed in his hand the key with which he fumbled at the lock of the spiritual world. But it was the black arts which held him with the most potent charm; mathematical accuracy, or careful experiments were never to his taste. He pored over Albertus Magnus and Paracelsus; with fearful steps he pursued wild hopes of communion with the departed dead;

'Eager he reads whatever tells
Of magic Cabbala and spells.'

Y 2

While

While his character and his studies thus withdrew him from real life, he began to read philosophy. In the train of scientific investigations followed speculations in religion and metaphysics, stimulated by Godwin and Condorcet. Of man as a political animal he knew absolutely nothing. From his school-experience he argued that society was organized tyranny; he met with no friends who practised the spirit of the Christianity they professed; he encountered no wise controlling influence to direct his eager studies. Thus at seventeen he judged controversies which he imperfectly comprehended, propagated free-thought when he had not learned to think freely for himself, rebelled against religion before he could test his own creed or that of others.

His stay at Oxford was too brief to correct the errors or extravagances into which he had fallen. Few more lifelike portraits exist in English literature than the picture which Hogg has painted of Shelley at the University. As the artist depicts Shelley's unworldliness and wayward eccentricities; his disinterestedness, generosity, and benevolence; his keen pursuit of knowledge; his pure and lofty enthusiasm; his loving, earnest, sensitive nature; his artless innocence and child-like fervour; a character is presented to us which is as lifelike as it is loveable. At first sight the practical man of the world seems to do scanty justice to the mental powers of the poet; but on every page the shrewd North-countryman pays homage to the splendour of his friend's genius, a homage which is the more effective because of the good-natured contempt with which it is blended and partially concealed.

We have laid stress on this period of Shelley's life because, as it seems to us, Shelley passed out into the grown-up world of actual life in mind a genius, in moral character and perception a child. By the peculiarities of his disposition he escaped the discipline which trains the child first for school and then for manhood; he lived in his own imaginings and not in reality; common-sense, concrete facts, experience had not controlled the inward force of his ideas or emotions, and they exercised little or no influence upon his actions. From the moment that he took his place among his contemporaries in the world he was at war with society; he was its aggressive foe: it retaliated by casting him outside its pale. His relations with his fellows confirmed his stubborn adherence to opinions which had fastened upon him before he had proved their soundness. Shelley's principles and his conduct cannot be defended without surrendering the fundamental laws of morality; his offences deserved the emphatic condemnation which they received; on adultery and desertion,

desertion, common-sense admits of no moral paradoxes. But the deep pathos of Shelley's career arises from the spectacle of a child punished as if it were a man, a child dazed by appeals to moral principles of which it is but dimly conscious, a child bewildered by blows inflicted for a fault which it does not understand. Yet, however pathetic the sight, the punishment was wholly inevitable; his conduct, though thoughtless as a child's, was fraught with the far-reaching, serious consequences of the actions of a man.

Kind to man and beast, Shelley was, like a child, capable of cruel actions. Tender-hearted and sensitive, he was obtuse to the delicate complexities of human relationship, and intolerant of opinions with which he did not sympathize. He trampled on the feelings of others, or outraged their most sacred shrines with the sublime unconsciousness of a child. In his impulsive eagerness he never realized that all men were not similarly constituted, or that he inflicted pain. Fascinated by whatever is mysterious and wonderful, credulous yet curious, strong in faith but ignorant of creeds, he was a restless investigator without a particle of reverence or impertinence. Fitful in his likes and dislikes, he passed, with a child's caprice, from passionate love to vehement abhorrence. His self-confident hopes of reforming the world would be arrogant and presumptuous, if they were not puerile. With a child's defiance, or rather ignorance, of public opinion, he translated his ideas into immediate action. He pushed his theories home to their extreme conclusions, because he recognized no necessary limitations, acknowledged no force in systems, nature, or habits, and saw no obstacles to the immediate realization of his millennial hopes. In his unconscious dignity, self-respect, and natural shrewdness, he was as truly a child as in his occasional incapacity for business, his recklessness in money matters, his ungovernable fits of helpless rage. Sensitive, generous, unselfish, he was a child in his modest simplicity and frank innocence; a child in his passionate enthusiasm, his pity for suffering, his ardent faith in the natural goodness of humanity. De Quincey was in his childhood the absolute ruler of Gombroom, as was Hartley Coleridge of the kingdom of Ejuxrea: but Shelley till his death ruled despotically over his ideal world; he retained the child's sight within his breast. As he sailed his paper boats, floated his fire-balloons, or blew his soap-bubbles, he preserved

‘by individual right

A young lamb's heart among the full-grown flocks.’

And, like a child, his moral sense was unformed; his will never

never asserted its supremacy: he acted solely on impulse. Loving and loveable, he was at once as winning, as wayward, and as unaccountable as a child.

The history of the growth of Shelley's moral character and poetical genius is one of late but continuous progress. Every year he grew in stature, morally and intellectually; he passed from prolonged childhood far on his way towards deferred manhood; but he had not, even at the time of his death, reached his full height. There is one seeming exception to this general truth. He appears to have reversed the usual processes of poets by beginning as the apostle of a creed, and subsequently abandoning his didactic purpose. But, in fact, he surrendered the noisy rhetoric of his youth for the beautiful idealisms in which his teaching was afterwards embodied. How great was his advance will be seen if we compare the tinsel glitter of 'Queen Mab' with the statuesque and radiant beauty of 'Prometheus Unbound'; the weak, confused battle scenes of the 'Revolt of Islam' with the distinct and vivid war pictures of 'Hellas'; the cloudy, unfinished 'Alastor' with the symmetrical and artistic 'Adonais.' On the one hand, he grew more forbearing in his opinions, more controlled in his sympathies, more thoughtful in his generousities, more sober in his enthusiasm. On the other, he advances from melody which is often meaningless to soul-inspiring poetry; from pictures which are indistinct in a blaze of colour, to studies of Nature that are the matured fruit of penetrating observation; his exquisite, sound music acquires a deeper undertone of meaning; his shadowy phantasms gain the reality of individual figures; to the iridescent play of pictorial fancy succeeds the harmonious simplicity of statuesque imagination: he rises, in fact, from the semblance to the vital essence of his art. As he matures from the intemperate iconoclast into something approaching a religious, if not a Christian, philosopher, and exchanges the narrow fanaticism of 'Queen Mab' for the liberal sympathies of 'Hellas,' so he ripens from the musician into the lyric singer, from the colourist into the creative poet.

The true defence of Shelley's life rests on his undeveloped moral sense. In other words, the most important feature in his character, the key to his action, the solution of his intellectual weakness, as also of his intellectual strength, is that he was not a man of principle, but only a child of impulse. It is from the abstract intensity of his impulsive nature that some of the most distinctive characteristics of his poetic genius are derived.

Shelley's radical defect, whether in the sphere of moral action or of intellectual effort, is the want of balance. As one of his
paper

paper boats, he scuds rudderless before the wind ; or floats, like his own fire-balloons, the sport of the capricious currents of mid-air. His moral conscience was never brought into play, his will never called into exercise, his sense of duty never developed, because he never chose between motives, or made his mind the scene of conflict between contending principles. His nature was rapt away without hindrance or struggle by the whirlwind of the momentary propensity : he becomes its incarnation, its embodiment. Like Laon, or Lionel, or the poet in 'Alastor,' or Francesco Cenci, or even Beatrice, Shelley is for the moment the personification of a solitary vice or virtue. The single impulse seized him, possessed him, dominated over him absolutely, ruled him without an effort. Now it was the impulse of love, the fierce, abrupt, but fitful passion, which flames up with sudden flash upon the perception of beauty, but fades as quickly as it rose ; now it was the impulse of reform, which carried him off his feet and overpowered every other feeling, or rather, like the wind that sweeps through the open gates of an abandoned palace, found no prejudice to overcome, no habit to constrain, no doubt to remove ; now it was the impulse to penetrate the mysteries of life which descended upon him

'Like the fierce fiend of a distempered dream,
And shook him from his rest, and led him forth
Into the darkness—'

spurred him on through tangled swamps and deep precipitous dells, led him on with lightning eye and eager breath to the lone Chorasmian shore, and urged him to embark in the crazy shallop,

'And meet lone Death on the drear ocean's waste.'

Wordsworth could only represent three characters—Wordsworth at his best, Wordsworth at his worst, and somebody else. Shelley, even more than Wordsworth, has written himself into his poetry. His poems are mirrors in which are reflected, more or less clearly, every phase of his emotions. If the domination of impulse supplies the true key to Shelley's life and character, its influence on his poetry must be strongly perceptible. It is in fact conspicuous in the greatest of all Shelley's poetic gifts, his chief poetic defects, and the form in which his poetic genius finds its most perfect expression. To state the same point in different language, the influence of impulse for good or evil is evident upon his ideality, his remoteness from human life, and his short outbursts of lyric inspiration.

Shelley's exalted rank among creative poets is mainly due to his ideality, in other words to his power of seizing on spiritual significances,

significances, and clothing them in striking forms. His precious gift depends, in the first instance, on his fine perception of the analogies between the physical and natural worlds. His mind was sheer in its surface. Even love found no promontories round which to twine its tendrils, no crannies into which to strike its roots. Shelley had no experiences, memories, or associations with which to occupy his thoughts, and thus was driven to study things not in their external relations, not with their surroundings or their accidents, but as they were in themselves. In other words, he resolved them into their elements; he penetrated to their essence. As he drove the shuttle of his thoughts to and fro between the abstract vision of his intellect and the earth-born shape of his concrete experience, he wove them together in a web of correspondencies. The threads are often fine as gossamers, but if the eye follows them as they sparkle with the fresh dews of genius, there will be revealed new relations which link together objects that before seemed sundered by a chasm as wide as that which separates earth from heaven.

Another element in Shelley's ideality is the capacity to feel intensely. Large-minded, many-sided men feel less readily than those who, like Shelley, are single-minded, and one-sided. Shelley felt strongly because he felt simply. He carried passion into all his intellectual pursuits. The strength of his poetic temperament lies in his sensibility, the weakness in his want of will. His emotions quickly overpowered his intellect, because they found no fixed convictions to remove, no current of habit to stem. But while his sensibility rivalled in its intensity that of the most sublime creative poets, he was too completely subdued by his feelings to attain the highest degree of inspiration. He had no central, well-poised citadel from which to contemplate the passion that possessed him, and turn it to the best account. In giving shape to his perceptions and expression to his feelings he was aided by a rich imagination, which no growth of character or experience of realities had impoverished. His conceptive and dramatic faculty exercised over him the same despotic power with which it sways children or primitive races. Like them, he saw gigantic shapes in the clouds, and heard doleful voices in the wind. The copious gift of language, which so often invades the world of the imagination, never weakened his visual powers or destroyed his world of glorious illusions.

Shelley thus possessed the keen perception which penetrates into inner and spiritual meanings, the sensibility which feels intensely, the imagination that instinctively finds concrete expressions for thought or feeling. He brought such passion

to bear upon his abstractions, that to converse with his exquisite creations becomes a boon, almost as priceless as to witness the quarrel between Oberon and Titania. He possessed that singleness of mind and view which is rare in our complex civilization. Liberty bursts upon his entranced gaze in all her naked purity, freed from the limitations and conditions of society and of politics. Love possessed his absorbed imagination as a self-existent, self-complete spirit, not necessarily incarnate in any individual form, but ranging free and uncontrolled throughout the world. So again Beauty seized upon him to the exclusion for the moment of every other thought; he stripped her of the accidents of humanity, and then, by the intensity of his concentration, vitalized his abstract and diaphanous conception. His narrow mind focused, as it were, the rays of genius till the flame of life was kindled; his conceptions cease to be descriptions; they become objects of love or hate. He creates figures to express his feeling of the all-pervading spirit which rules creation and of its various effluences which animate the elements. He abstracts, and then personifies, the genius of humanity or the ideal of womanhood, just as he tenants every river with its deity, every star with living shapes. To him his types and abstract conceptions, ghostly though they are, possess such reality that he addresses them with a glow of lyric passion, which surpasses in intensity of heat the most fervid expression of emotion excited in colder men by living figures. The minds of other poets are more diffuse; they do not present the same sheer surface, but are indented, many folded, deep recessed. Liberty, love, and beauty, appear to them in the midst of associations, memories, habits, realities. They could not, if they would, vitalize them as abstractions. They are comparatively sluggish and impassive because there is a greater mass to kindle. But if such rich, self-poised natures are strongly stirred, they bring to bear upon their emotions broad human energies, and a ripe ethical wisdom which is altogether wanting in the thin fanatical passion of Shelley. To them, for instance, beauty is inseparable from its surroundings; it suggests individuals, colour, form, mind, and all the component elements of mortal loveliness; they realize exquisite embodiments of beauty suffused with human warmth and glow. Shelley alone has vitalized Beauty in her elemental purity; but his conceptions are thin in outline, æthereal in substance; they are uniform and comprehended at a glance; they have not the variety, the intricacy, the humanity of the visions of Beauty which other poets have dreamed.

Shelley owes his gift of ideality to his narrow, intense, one-sided,

sided, abstract nature. To the same source must be traced the greatest of his poetic defects, his remoteness from human interests. A mind that realizes abstract conceptions by stripping off all concrete properties, and ignoring separable accidents or mutable surroundings, is necessarily deficient in its grasp of real life; it clasps only shadows. Its creations move in the Elysian Fields of the imagination, and not in the working world. If it deals with human character it ignores complexities, and produces personifications of isolated qualities. There is in Shelley's beautiful idealisms none of the mature wisdom which is the most enduring and inestimable element of the highest poetry. He was too eager and intense for tranquility or self-command. In vehemence of passionate pursuit he chases the visions of æthereal beauty, in which his imagination clothes its thronging thoughts, down every avenue that the most remote analogy could suggest to a subtle and analytical mind. Too volatile to hold up a subject before his mind's eye till he had exhausted its capacity, he allows his fancy to flutter round the original idea till it is dazed and bewildered; too impetuous to be critical he multiplies arabesques of figures which are individually beautiful but collectively incongruous. At the same time, his habit of looking at things through the coloured glasses of his emotions often robs his landscapes of firmness and truth. He contemplates inanimate Nature, as he did mankind, with the half-closed eyes of one who is in a trance; he interprets the language in which his own spirit communes with the spirit of the scene. Except in the distinct descriptions contained in 'Julian and Maddalo,' or the direct studies of atmospheric effects, everything is allegorized and idealized. Substance fades when the characteristics of nature change with his moods, and the 'orbèd maiden with white fire laden' becomes a 'dying lady lean and pale.' Shelley, with his quivering sensibility, his fresh imagination, his intense and simple nature, treats stream and fountain, cloud and bird, in the true spirit of a mythological poet. He associates inanimate matter with the attributes of sentient mind; endows it with his own passions; tinges it with the hues of his own life. His pictures are so charged with supernatural life, that he seems unable to observe without personifying. We might suggest in passing that this power of personification prevented him from realizing the need of a Creator. His own moods, or the actions by which his mental changes were expressed, formed no permanent essential part of himself; he could, without effort, transfer them to Nature. He believed them to be shared by all his fellows; why should they not be the common property of the created world? The identity of feeling, which he thus establishes

establishes between himself and Nature, is as fascinating as it is peculiar. Yet it is certainly a sign of weakness. In 'Alastor,' for instance, he reads into his surroundings his own pensive and melancholy life. Autumn sighs in the sere woods; the moss shudders, the grass shivers at the touch of the poet's foot; his own hair sings dirges in the wind. No man whose personality is strongly marked can thus transfer himself to the natural world. In Shelley the sense of personality was dimmed by the absence of will. He never learned to distinguish between his own feelings and those of others; but in his later poetry he shakes off the excessive morbidity of 'Alastor.' If he makes the sensitive plant feel the anguish of an unrealizable ideal, he no longer reads his own misery into the aerial merriment of the wind, the wave, and the bird. The contrast offers a significant proof of the steady development of the stronger sides of his character.

Shelley's poetic defects correspond to his poetic excellencies. His power of abstracting and vitalizing ideal conceptions withdrew him from human sympathies; the narrowness and sheer surface of his intense mind enabled him to give life to his imaginative creations, but it also rendered him too volatile and restless to be either self-possessed or self-critical; his want of will aided him unconsciously to personify natural objects, though it at the same time blurred the distinctness of his pictures. In Shelley's lyrics no corresponding defects impair the excellencies which he derives from his mental constitution. Here all is gain. The intimate connection of an impulsive nature with pre-eminence in short bursts of lyric passion is so obvious that it need not be indicated at length. It is in lyrics that his poetic genius finds its most perfect expression. In no other poet does the spiritual fire burn with such fierce intensity. These jets of inspiration fulfil his own definition of poetry: they are 'the record of the best and happiest moments of his life,' or rather of the moments when his feelings are most deeply stirred.

In his best lyric work he is not so much an intellectual craftsman as an instrument swept by the whirlwind of emotional inspiration. His shorter poems are flawless as diamonds. They possess that unstudied perfection which makes other compositions appear artificial. They resemble the statues of Phidias which flowed into form, and started into life like a dream. They are fused with the feeling they express; the whole is melted like wax into one impression. Language bends and plays beneath his hand, as if it too shared his internal mechanism of nerve and muscle, and felt the pressure of his mind from one extremity

extremity to the other. The greatest power is combined with the greatest ease, the perfection of art with the entire absence of conscious display. The variety of moods of which he is master is unlimited. Now his passion rushes forth rolling like thunder and blinding with the white glare of its lightning; now he sweeps the strings with a swift exultant stroke as though the earth and the isles were glad, and the hosts of heaven shouted for joy: now he calls forth a strain of ideal love as dainty and aerial in its elemental passion as if he played on the small, clear, silvery lute of the young spirit that sits in the morning star; and now he moans a wail of dread and despair at once human and unearthly, as if his harp were touched by the skill of the drear breeze of winter, or as if he himself had become the lyre from which the west wind strikes the surging tumult of its deep autumnal tones. It is in moments such as these, or when he mounts upwards pouring forth his eddying song of joyous aspiration, or sweeps strong, swift, and eagle-winged, through the morning clouds of Liberty, that Shelley shows himself to be the unrivalled lord and master of lyric song. It is these rapturous moments of inspiration, and not the vast conception of 'Prometheus Unbound,' or the lurid power of 'The Cenci,' or a romantic fairy tale of Nature like the 'Witch of Atlas,' that constitute Shelley's most enduring claim to the crown of immortality.

It would be presumptuous in us to attempt a criticism of Shelley's poetry in the space left at our command. The remarks that precede and those that follow must be rather understood as an endeavour to elucidate Shelley's character from his poetry, than as an attempt to appreciate the value of his poetic writings.

Shelley's departure for Italy in March, 1818, divides his poetry into two parts. Sufficient stress has hardly been laid upon the extraordinary advance which is conspicuous in his Italian style. The English poems in execution, imagery, and machinery, belong to an inferior order. In his later work Shelley learned to subordinate fancy to imagination, and didactic purpose to lyrical passion, as well as to distinguish the ideal from the actual. Two out of the three English poems are, like 'Rosalind and Helen' which belongs to both periods, attempts to produce a sustained narrative. If what has been said of Shelley's character is true, narrative is the last field in which he was calculated to achieve success. Externally the English poetry is warm and glowing in colour, rich in details, delicate in elaboration; but in distinctness, simplicity of execution, and boldness of construction, the Italian poetry is infinitely superior.

The

The later poems are imaginative rather than fanciful, classical not romantic, dramatic or lyrical rather than narrative or didactic. In depth of meaning, the superiority of the Italian compositions is still more clearly marked. The charm of Shelley's early poetry is evanescent, because it is unsubstantial. It is the work of a man who appeals to the feelings rather than the intellect, of a rhapsodist rather than a creative poet. The strain of impassioned sentiment and glowing imagery cannot blend with the realities with which he professes to deal without incongruity.

'Queen Mab' is a strange intermixture of vigorous declamation with incomprehensible symbolism,

'a phantasmal portraiture
Of wandering human thought,'

a shifting quicksand of youthful opinions on which it is impossible to rear any solid fabric. It is significant of the early stage in Shelley's poetic development, that he creates no new embodiment of the Mediator between Man and the spirit of Nature, but utilizes, for a great and serious purpose, the stock and sportive conception of a fairy. 'The Revolt of Islam' is the most promising of Shelley's early compositions. It is a failure, but a splendid one. The unreal hero and heroine, and the fanciful world through which they move, fail to arouse our sympathies. No one can be interested in mortals, idealized beyond the likeness of humanity, moving across a stage, which is a travesty of real life. The metre is skilfully handled; but, though appropriate to Spenser's gorgeous Utopianism, it is ill-adapted for Shelley's fervent idealism. Yet the poem is in itself full of beauties. Its chief promise lies in the power of imaginative realization. Shelley turns his realities into abstractions; he makes his abstractions realities. He has no grasp of actual life, but the force of his imaginative presentation is already startling. All the swift checks and chances in the terrific struggle between the Eagle and the Serpent, every golden feather, every mailed coil of the combatants stand out in the shaft of light, which his imagination throws upon the fray. 'Alastor' seems to us at once a less faulty, and a less promising poem than 'The Revolt of Islam.' It is more real, because the poet is a study of Shelley as he was, and not, like *Laon*, an idealization of what he wished to be. Over the poem hangs the shadow of impending death. We have already alluded to its morbid tone. It is full of beautiful passages of description; but even the exultation that is bred from the contemplation of Nature is chilled by contact with the actualities of life.

In

In March, 1818, Shelley crossed Les Echelles and the Mont Cenis, and descended into Italy. The paradise of exiles opened to him a new garden of delight under a serener heaven, and on a fairer earth. His poetic genius dilated and gathered strength. Day and night he watched the face of the sky, till he won by his worship the secrets of its lights and shades and rapid transformations. No evanescent mood of the atmosphere escaped his watchful eye, and here alone he deals with the elements as he found them. He knew every Protean shape with which cloud and rain could clothe the olive sandalled Apennines, or the Alps islanded in misty distance. His sense of colour became preternaturally acute, as his observation became more patient and minute. In the leafy bowers, where he mused and wrote, he made every tint and scent and form of tree and flower his own. The sea had always fascinated him, but fresh joy came to him with sudden access as he contemplated the waters of the Bay of Naples, now reflecting the purple heaven of an Italian noon, now so translucent as to lay bare the cavern where Panthea slept locked in young Ione's soft and milky arms. His imagination grew stronger, brighter, and more piercing, as he feasted on the treasures of the arts and antiquity of Italy, her buildings, tombs, painting, and sculpture, her thrilling associations and richly coloured memories; or revived the lost life of the ancient world in its hypæthric temples, its disinterring cities, its labyrinthine ruins, which Nature made her own when man had left them to decay. Humbler sights and sounds soothed and tranquillized his spirit. The fire-flies flashing in the myrtle hedges, the chirrup of the cicada, the songs of the peasant sweetened by distance, cheered his existence; even the dove-coloured oxen spoke to him of peace; the rapture of the skylark thrilled his heart with the bird's own joy; the soft note of the aziola, and the elysian chant of the voluptuous nightingale, breathed repose as evening and night descended. Among such surroundings his mind mellowed and expanded. The books which he studied tended in the same direction. It was now that he took Plato for his guide. From Dante, Ariosto, Tasso, Petrarch, Calderon, and the Bible, he learned to appreciate the finer humanities of Christianity; he was filled with a new sense of the meaning of Chivalry and Catholicism. The crudities of his youthful theories were dissolved; the harshness of his noisy atheism was softened. Yet he was at times plunged in deep despondency. The death of Harriet, the separation from his children, his exile and isolation from friends, the indifference, if not hostility, which was shown to his poetic powers, preyed upon his spirits. He lost first his infant daughter

daughter Clara, then the 'lodestar of his life,' the Willmouse of the Diary. Harassed by Godwin's extortionate demands, ailing in body, racked with pain, he often failed to find peace and calm even in his own home. To such moments of depression many of his poems give voice. But their tone is never, as has already been pointed out, entirely despondent or hopeless. His mind had grown in strength and vigour; it was soothed and mellowed, softened and enriched.

The four years which he spent in Italy were marvellously fertile. Within this interval are concentrated all his completed masterpieces. It includes 'Prometheus Unbound,' 'The Witch of Atlas,' and 'Epipsychidion' in ideal poetry; in familiar verse, 'Julian and Maddalo' and 'The Letter to Maria Gisborne,' in tragedy 'The Cenci'; in elegiac odes, 'Adonais.' The list closes with 'Hellas,' which he calls an improvise, but which contains two of the most exquisite lyrics that even Shelley ever wrote, 'Worlds on worlds are rolling ever' and 'The world's great age begins anew.' Besides these completed works are a number of magnificent fragments and shorter poems, together with lyric gems which have never been equalled for beauty. By his grotesque poetry we set but little store; there is more real humour in his letters than is to be found in the heavy wit of 'Swellfoot the Tyrant' or 'Peter Bell the Third.' As a translator Shelley has had few, if any, equals; but he attached little importance to the exercise of the gift, and only amused himself with it as a relief from original composition. To all this mass of poetry must be added many incomplete essays and prose fragments, and a series of letters which, for beauty of thought and expression, place Shelley among the first of English prose writers.

To deal in detail with the productions of this prolific period would be impossible at the close of an article which has already exceeded our usual limits. Only a few salient features can be noticed in illustration of his character.

'Julian and Maddalo' is in some respects Shelley's most remarkable achievement. He altogether abandons his favourite realm of dream-like speculation; he pursues no vision of love or beauty, in which he incarnates his millennial hopes. The poem gives us a poet's perception of real life. Familiar sights, thoughts, and occurrences, are not idealized, but directly represented. The necessity of grappling with facts and human beings imparts strength and firmness to his touch. He allegorizes neither his characters nor his scenery, but paints both with a concrete definiteness which the poetic atmosphere of the whole is never permitted to blur. The charm of the poem

poem is derived from qualities which Shelley nowhere else displays. The vigour of the handling, the clearness of the language, the ease of the narrative, the directness of the description, win a triumph for Shelley in a previously unknown field. 'Julian and Maddalo' gives a useful warning against the futility of dogmatizing about genius. It also offers an insoluble problem to all who refuse to recognise the possibilities of Shelley's maturing genius, or to see the strong vein of practical shrewdness which ran through the poet's character. The only lines of Shelley's poetry which have passed into proverbial currency are taken from 'Julian and Maddalo.'

'Most wretched men
Are cradled into poetry by wrong;
They learn in suffering what they teach in song.'

'Julian and Maddalo' in some respects prepares the way for 'The Cenci.' In this tragic study of character Shelley gave a second proof of his surprising versatility. He showed himself possessed of dramatic powers for which neither he himself nor his friends were prepared. But 'The Cenci' is, in our opinion, less phenomenal than 'Julian and Maddalo.' Supremely tragic circumstances, such as those of Beatrice, raise characters to that idealized existence in which Shelley himself lived; the life which he describes is not ordinary life, but life at the highest possible pressure. The subject of 'The Cenci,' though treated with the utmost delicacy, is repulsive; the moral ugliness is unredeemed by the artistic beauty; the whole play is overcharged with a dark atmosphere of horror. It is not till the fifth act that Beatrice affords adequate relief, and this because sympathy with her character is attracted less by moral strength or beauty, than by native dignity and monstrous wrong. The interest of the plot is unduly monopolized by Beatrice and her father; they are drawn with a power and firmness which makes the subordinate figures meagre and shadowy. Both the principal figures are dramatically exhibited; they show themselves and are not analyzed by the author. But as characters they are wanting in complexity. The force, with which Shelley has presented the lurid hell of Francesco Cenci's heart, or idealized the beauty and horror of the pale face of Beatrice which still looks down with tear-dimmed eyes and pathetic expression of mute appeal from the walls of the Barberini palace, is marvellous in its imaginative sympathy. Yet both Beatrice and her father are personifications, not characters. Shelley could not depict the conflict through which their souls had passed, because his own mind was too undivided to be

the

the scene of such a struggle. Hence the passions are drawn without gradations of shade. Both characters are too simple; they represent one essential vice and virtue. Each is absorbed in one thought; only one attribute is shown, whether it be the love of evil for evil's sake, or the craving to expiate a monstrous wrong. Thus it is that, with all the power which is lavished on the play, Beatrice and Francesco remain personifications, like the shapes that met at Wordsworth's ideal grove—

‘Fear and trembling Hope,
Silence and Foresight, Death the skeleton,
And Time the shadow.’

In 'Prometheus Unbound,' Shelley's faith in the ultimate triumph of good found its most complete and ideal expression. He no longer, as in 'The Revolt of Islam,' blends truth with fiction; scene, stage, and actors, are in unison. The harmony shows the intellectual accuracy and sense of fitness which Shelley was developing. The lyrical drama is by no means faultless, and unfortunately for its popularity, the faults lie thickest at the outset. But if the reader perseveres, he will be swept upwards in a whirlwind of song from height to height, and ledge to ledge, till he reaches a dizzy summit of lyric inspiration, where no foot but Shelley's ever trod before. The grandeur of the conception, the vivid embodiment in beautiful form of inspiring dreams, the majestic soliloquy of Prometheus with which the play opens, the exquisite speech of Asia, are forgotten in the music of the lyric outbursts, which send a sob of hopeless anguish echoing down the slopes of Caucasus, or convey in sparkling words the arrowy summons to delight of a fresh spring morning, or express with the most deft and unobtrusive harmony of words the thrilling intensity of the passion of love. Yet the drama is finely conceived and firmly compacted. It cannot be fairly condemned because it is wanting in solidity, since its very essence is incorporeal, elemental, ideal. In imaginative realization and creative energy, 'Prometheus Unbound' is a masterly achievement. To Milton, Satan and the infernal world were real. He believed in the unseen beings to which he gave such grand and majestic forms. But Shelley knew that, in realizing his airy abstractions, his imagination was at work upon the shadows of a dream. He began, if we may so speak, a stage further back than Milton; he built on no foundation of faith. Hence the vitalizing power, which Shelley displays in 'Prometheus Unbound,' affords the highest test of his imaginative genius. 'Julian and Maddalo' and 'The Cenci' prove that Shelley had the power to sing of real life.

Vol. 164.—No. 328. z

life. Yet he deliberately chose the realm of idealism. He had counted the cost of neglecting terrestrial conditions; but he remained faithful to his view of the poetic function. In 'Prometheus' itself he answers, as if by anticipation, the charge of remoteness from human sympathies. The two fauns, who hear the delicate music of the spirits in the woods, wonder that they catch no glimpse of the singers. They represent the cultivated men of the day, who live surrounded by Nature's mysteries, but make no effort to penetrate her secrets. Too engrossed in the problems of real life, their wonder passes as soon as it is expressed. They will not follow the aerial strain lest—

'thwart Silenus find his goats undrawn,
And grudge to sing those wise and lovely songs
Of Fate, and Chance, and God, and chaos old,
And Love, and the chained Titan's woful doom,
And how he shall be loosed, and make the world
One brotherhood.'

With the more statuesque beauty of 'Prometheus Unbound' should be contrasted the rich colouring of that carnival of fancy the 'Witch of Atlas,' and the bodiless passion of 'Epipsychidion.' The 'Witch of Atlas' is a fantastic extravaganza, which must be read in the spirit in which it was written. Shelley soars upwards with a cry of delight from the earthy atmosphere of 'The Cenci,' and wantons in the imagined world, forgetting the realities to which he had so lately stooped. Another side of Shelley's ideality, the tempestuous strength of his abstract passion, finds in 'Epipsychidion' its most remarkable illustration. That rhapsodical ecstasy on Emilia Viviani, in whom, with inconsistent anthropomorphism, he realizes his dream of divine love and beauty, is a poem of the soul only. Yet the mystical romance of Platonic love palpitates with an intensity of passion. The hidden meanings of portions of the framework remain inexplicable mysteries; it would be well if the real and concrete elements could be forgotten, for their incongruous union with the abstract and ideal disfigures the beauty of one of Shelley's most characteristic compositions. In these three poems Shelley shows the creative energy of the statuary who conceives and incarnates in form his sublime conceptions, the brilliant inventiveness of the colourist who commands an inexhaustible variety of brilliant images, the abstract intensity of the pure idealist who is thrilled through and through by a passion which is at once intangible and impersonal.

In 'Prometheus Unbound,' the 'Witch of Atlas,' and 'Epipsychidion'

psychidion,' Shelley is necessarily far removed from human interests; he is abstract, æthereal, impersonal. The same characteristic, which here becomes a fault, mars the perfection of 'Adonais,' the best known of Shelley's longer poems. Here the subject concentrates the diffuseness of his imagination, draws together the loose texture of his genius, gives a sustained splendour and an artistic completeness to the whole. For interest, beauty of treatment, and finished execution, 'Adonais' ranks, by the side of 'Lycidas' and 'In Memoriam,' as one of the three greatest monodies in the English language. But to us it is wanting in human sympathy. Shelley exalts the memory of Keats; he feels his death as a personal wrong, and he stirs our indignation. But he never strives to elicit our tears. The emotion to which he appeals is the most fitful and transient of human feelings, and, in this instance, the appeal is founded on a misconception of facts. He adapts his self-communion to the temporary wants of his own heart; he does not address himself to the eternal sympathies of his audience. A great part of the fascination which 'Adonais' exercises is due to the beauty of the poetic machinery. Shelley creates his own mythology, or rather modernizes that of Moschus and Bion whose elegies he also translated. He gives new life and deeper meaning to each figure in the stately procession which he summons to mourn for 'Adonais.' The individual forms stand out clear and distinct, each more beautiful than its predecessor, till the noble pageant ends with the exquisite portrait of Shelley himself.

This power of modernizing ancient myths is one of Shelley's unique gifts. Whether he recalled the visions of Pagan mythology or created, by his own fresh imagination, new nurslings of immortality, his abstract, æthereal genius gave him exceptional advantages over all who attempt a similar task. His figures are wholly without sensuous beauty; they are radiant, air-born, diaphanous beings, clear in outline, pure in tint, and free from earthly taint of material grossness. Wherever the space is large, the exquisite grace of his imagination is apt to be disguised or disfigured. His creations are sublime in their original conception, but they fail in sustained energy; the first sketch of the actors in 'Prometheus' is Titanic in grandeur of outline, but towards the close they dwindle to proportions which but little exceed those of ordinary mortals. Wanting, as Shelley does, the calm seriousness and deep practical wisdom of the greatest of his rivals, he sometimes shows his want of sympathy with living interests, and destroys the harmony of his figures, as in 'Epipsychidion,' by blending concrete realities with abstract

z 2

idealisms.

idealisms. Sometimes, as in the 'Witch of Atlas,' his prodigal invention, uncontrolled by critical self-command, carries ornament to an excess which destroys all sense of solidity.

Shelley's imagination was, like his passion, lyric: its single flashes are more telling than its elaborate designs. Shelley was, as we have seen, gifted with a more delicate and susceptible temperament than ordinary mortals. Sights and sounds, that leave most men cold and unsympathetic, fired him with enthusiasm, or stung him into wrath; faculties in him were vigilant, that in others were dormant; feelings, that slept in others, in him were open-eyed; he was as

'a nerve o'er which do creep
The else unfelt oppressions of this earth.'

Together with this susceptible temperament he possessed an astonishing gift of clothing in words every subtle feeling, of seizing the most rapidly evanescent shades of emotion, of embodying in language the most sudden sensations that penetrated from without, or rushed up from within, his eager, tender nature. In short poems his intensity of feeling enjoyed full play, and found no scope for its corresponding defects. He required no sustained energy, but a flame-like burst of emotion; he needed not to control his ecstasy, he has only to become its passive instrument. His creative power is electrified by a single flash of vivid feeling; he writes not only with spontaneity, but with singleness of effect. Conceptions and feelings so subtle as to elude ordinary perception stir Shelley to his inmost depths. Gusts of anguish, despair, love, or joy, sweep over every man, but Shelley alone has given them full voice: the finest effects which they produce are so faint as to be lost on less sensitive natures, or so transient that they fade, before men endowed with smaller powers of expression have fixed them in appropriate language. This copious gift of words never subdued his imagination. It remained at once statuesque and pictorial, capable both of sportive invention and sublime conception, keenly sensitive to firmness of beautiful outline as well as niceties of light and shade, and delicate distinctions of colour. The same weaknesses of character, which disfigure his longer outbursts of passion, mar the concerted displays of his imagination. It is in exquisite detached glimpses of the ideal world that Shelley is unrivalled and pre-eminent. His imaginative insight into the thought of the ancient world, his habit of penetrating to essential principles and abstracting isolated qualities, his rich gifts of ideal realization, hisceptive faculties, at once so powerful and so delicate, revealed

to

to him forms that never gladdened the eyes of obtuser men. It is with the essential spirit of classic poets that his odes to the 'Cloud' and the 'West Wind' are inspired, and to Shelley alone were visible the immortal vision of the 'Hours,' the bright print of the morning winged feet of the infant Frost, or the spirit of the Earth

'Pillowed upon its alabaster arms,
Like to a child o'er wearied with sweet toil,
On its own folded wings and wavy hair.'

At other times he found Pagan divinities in cloud and wave and star. He beheld Arethusa leap in panic fear from ledge to ledge pursued by the river god Alpheus, saw blue Proteus on his humid throne, and the white-armed Nereids with streaming hair and wavering limbs, followed the footsteps of Apollo as he paved the clouds with fire, heard Arion sing as he rode the dolphin's back, gazed on Mercury trampling the slant winds with golden-sandalled feet, or caught a glimpse of old Silenus with his staff of lilies, and all the blithe crew of wood gods, Fauns and Sylvens, as they hurried through the forest glades.

Many a 'thwart Silenus' has sung his wise and lovely songs: but the quality of Shelley's delicate music is peculiarly his own. There are but two or three poets at the most whom literature could less afford to lose than this solitary master of æthereal verse. His songs were not of men; they are clogged by no terrestrial conditions; yet the working world will never cease to listen to the 'sweet pipings' of Shelley, who, in his own 'Hymn to Pan,' sums up the character of his life and poetry:

'I sang of the dancing stars,
I sang of the dædal earth,
And of heaven, and the Giant wars,
And love and death and birth.
And then I changed my pipings,—
Singing how, down the vale of Mænalus
I pursued a maiden, and clasped a reed;
Gods and men, we are all deluded thus;
It breaks in our bosom, and then we bleed.'

ART. II.—1. *The Life and Writings of Charles Leslie, M.A., Nonjuring Divine.* By the Rev. R. J. Leslie. London, 1885.

2. *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic.* By the Rev. J. H. Overton. London, 1881.

OF the problems left by primitive Christianity for future generations to solve, the widest, and if we may judge from experience the most perplexing, is the adaptation of its principles to the various provinces of human life and conduct. The right application to these of the law of the kingdom of Heaven is certainly not among the things which are revealed to babes. In this field of action, mere conscientiousness or rectitude of intention is no sure preservative from error. Mistakes, often carrying with them the most disastrous consequences, even wrecking the usefulness of individuals and the peace of communities, mark the historical course of the Church, and testify that only at the cost of many futile experiments and pernicious failures has progress in this practical science been achieved. The reason of this is not far to seek. Contrasted with Judaism, and indeed with all other historical religions, Christianity is not a system of rigid precepts by which conduct can be infallibly guided, but a spirit, a principle, an inward law, aspiring to purify and regulate the temper, the motives, and the aims, while it leaves their practical developments to be fashioned by the individual judgment, after consideration of the circumstances to be dealt with in each particular case. And since, in the course of ages and the vicissitudes of the social order, the circumstances may vary almost without limit, the habits and lines of conduct which at one time are the most in accordance with the Christian spirit, and rightly approve themselves to the conscience, may at another epoch wear the very opposite aspect and frustrate the ends which Christianity is intended to promote. In scarcely any case, outside the fundamental rules of morality, can such precepts and examples as the sacred books of our religion contain be taken literally for an authoritative guide of conduct under all circumstances, without risk of falling into some grievous blunder. The more resolute we are to act in their spirit, the more bound we are to hold ourselves free from being coerced by their outward form and bare letter. But this distinction between the spirit and the letter, between the immutable principle and the changeable expression of it in action and conduct, is just that which is most difficult to be drawn with precision and confidence. The unenlightened fail to understand it, the scrupulous stumble at it, the

the self-seeking abuse it. Hence has sprung a plentiful crop of controversies, divisions, offences against religion and society, by which the ecclesiastical and civil orders have been disturbed, to the great detriment both of Church and State.

These reflections are suggested to us by the biographical works named above, which have recently revived attention to the almost forgotten sect of the Nonjurors. To every one whose judgment is not warped by ecclesiastical prejudices it must, we think, by this time be tolerably clear that the schism, originated at the Revolution of 1688 by the Primate Sancroft, and a small number of the bishops and clergy, had no other justification than one of those misapprehensions of the genius of Christianity to which we have alluded. It would have been impossible but for the strange notion, that the Bible is a manual of practical politics, and defines for all ages the rights of monarchs and the duties of their subjects. Such a misreading of Holy Writ surely ought not to have been adopted by the heads of a Church, which had denied the right of the mere letter of Biblical precepts and instances to prevail against the dictates of the moral judgment, by affirming in her Articles the lawfulness of oaths and military service and capital punishments, and denouncing the communism in favour of which the Sermon on the Mount and the example of the primitive Christians had been pleaded. Within such a Church no room ought to have been found for the preposterous notions, that a rule of civil polity binding in conscience on all Christians may be drawn from the first four chapters of Genesis, and that a perpetual charter of immunity for unbridled despotism may be based on St. Paul's precept, enjoining on his converts obedience to the Roman government.

But during the preceding reigns circumstances had betrayed the Anglican Church into the mistake of endeavouring to strengthen her position, by fathering on Scripture a doctrine which invested hereditary monarchs with an inviolable sacredness, and prescribed to their subjects the duty, under all provocations, of non-resistance and passive obedience; and as might have been expected, the whirligig of time brought in its revenge. When at length the nation, in the exercise of its supreme right of self-preservation, saved itself from an intolerable tyranny by a solemn and deliberate change of its ruler, the Church was compelled to reconsider her new political doctrine, and ascertain whether with a good conscience she could acquiesce in the change, and enjoy the benefit which Providence had brought to her doors. With more than half the bishops, twenty-nine thirtieths of the clergy, and the laity in general, common sense prevailed,

prevailed, aided no doubt by an instinctive repugnance to disturbance and self-sacrifice for the sake of an idea. Any way, with whatever differences of political opinions and desires, there was an almost universal agreement that no sufficient ground existed for a breach between the Church and the State. To the Primate, however, and a small minority of the bishops, it seemed otherwise. Unable to extricate themselves from the spurious doctrine, which made it a matter of conscience to refuse allegiance to the new occupants of the throne whom the nation had deliberately chosen, they were not content to retire, as they might easily have done, for the relief of their own consciences and for the peace of the Church; they judged it right to secede, and to set up themselves and their handful of adherents as the true Church of England. The Establishment, against which they shook off the dust of their feet, became hateful in their eyes, and was denounced by them as rebellious and apostate. To hold communion with it was regarded by them as sinful, and lest the separation should expire with their own deaths, they thought it incumbent on them to take measures for its perpetuation by the appointment of successors to themselves. This, however, their devotion to the royal supremacy forbade them to do without first obtaining the sanction of the legitimate monarch; and thus was produced the curious spectacle of these prelates of the reformed Church of England sending over the water, to obtain from a bigoted papist the nomination of the proposed new bishops of the schism. James, accordingly, after consulting the heads of the Gallican hierarchy and the Vatican, directed two of the Nonjuring presbyters to be raised to the episcopate. Hickes and Wagstaffe were selected for the doubtful honour, and were consecrated by the suffragan titles of Thetford and Ipswich, but in such a hole-and-corner way that for a long time many of the Nonjurors themselves remained ignorant of the fact. The sincerity of Sancroft and his allies in carrying out their principles to this bitter end is not in question. It is their acknowledged conscientiousness that points our moral. What could more forcibly show the blindness to the spirit of Christianity which bondage to the letter of Scripture may produce, than the fact that honest and earnest-minded prelates, bent upon doing their duty at any personal sacrifice, could persuade themselves that they lay under an imperious obligation to risk the wrecking of the fortunes of the Church committed to their guidance, on a mere question of secular politics?

We have here two remarks to make, to prevent misapprehension. In blaming the schismatic action of the Nonjuring prelates,

prelates, we are not expressing any opinion on the decision of the legislature to impose on all holders of office, lay and ecclesiastical, an oath of allegiance to the new sovereigns. That Parliament was within its right in requiring this formal act of submission is beyond question; and the utmost consideration for tender consciences, supposing that there was to be an oath at all, was shown by prescribing a new form which left opinions free as to the title by which William and Mary sat on the throne. The previous oath, which implied the doctrine of hereditary right, was dropped, and the oath now imposed ran in this simpler form: 'I do sincerely promise and swear to bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary.' The only questionable point is the policy of requiring an oath at all on the change of the dynasty, especially from the Anglican clergy, taking the peculiar circumstances into consideration. Hallam, in discussing the matter, comes to the conclusion, that the reasons in favour of imposing the oath preponderated. But with that question, which is one of expediency, not of principle, we are not here concerned. The only matter we are dealing with is the action of the Nonjuring prelates, when the simple oath just cited, which pledged them to nothing but submission to the *de facto* sovereigns of the nation, was required of them by an undoubtedly competent authority.

Our other remark is that the blame of the schism does not lie on all the bishops who felt themselves so bound by the doctrine of legitimacy, and by their previous oath of allegiance to James, as to be unable conscientiously to take the new oath. These were nine in number. But the act of the legislature, while requiring the oath to be taken generally before August 1st, 1689, gave to ecclesiastics a further indulgence of six months before actual deprivation took place in case of persistent refusal; and before this period had elapsed three of the recusant prelates died, leaving only six to decide on their future action. Of these six Frampton, bishop of Gloucester, and Ken, of Bath and Wells, declined to be parties to setting up a separate sect; and thus Sancroft and three suffragans were the only prelates who were responsible for dividing the Church. Frampton's line of conduct after deprivation is thus sketched by Mr. Lathbury, the somewhat partial historian of the Nonjurors:—

'Frampton never had a desire to continue the separation. He could not take the oath of allegiance, and was prepared to suffer the consequences; but beyond this he did not wish to proceed. As long as he was able, he attended the service of the parish church in which he resided. He frequently catechised the children in the afternoon, and

and expounded the sermon which had been preached by the parochial clergyman.'

Of the saintly Ken, also, it may be said that although he was a Nonjuror in fact, in temper and conduct he was widely separated from Sancroft and the more extreme members of the party. After the settlement of the Crown he decided to take the new oath of allegiance, and began to draw up a pastoral letter to justify his action. But while he was writing, a fine-drawn scruple invaded his somewhat timid mind; and after vainly fighting against it he yielded, burnt the letter, and begged his friends to leave him alone, saying, that if, when the irrevocable step was once taken, he should be haunted by misgivings of its lawfulness, he should be a miserable man to the end of his days. His difficulty was to determine the point at which a legitimate sovereign forfeits by wrongdoing his claim to the allegiance of his subjects. That there is such a point he did not doubt, but whether James had reached it he could not feel certain; and to his tender conscience the doubt left no alternative but to retire, and make room for others who saw their way more clearly. He blamed no one who was bolder and more assured. If he did not go so far as to urge his friends to accept the oath, at least he rejoiced when they found themselves able to take it. Only for himself, for his own peace of mind, he felt it safer to exchange his station as a ruler of the Church for the privacy in which he could devote himself to the religious musings which he loved, and to the sacred hymnody by which his name has become a household word amongst all English-speaking Christians. It would have been better, perhaps, that he should have completed his self-abnegation by formally resigning his see, as he did a dozen years later on the appointment to it of a personal friend of his own by Queen Anne, and thus have freed his immediate successor's position from embarrassment. But his theory of 'the independency of the clergy on the lay-power' made him cling to the shadowy title of canonical bishop of the see, after his deprivation by the State; and as his successor, Bishop Kidder, belonged to the opposite party stigmatized as latitudinarian, Ken was the less disposed to make things easy for him. How strongly the ex-bishop felt about the spread of the 'latitudinarian taint' in his old diocese, appears from some verses which he composed in 1703, when Kidder and his wife were crushed to death in their bed by the fall of a stack of chimneys in the palace at Wells. Dreadful as the tragedy was, he found an alleviation of it in remembering that it 'freed his flock from uncanonic yoke,' and made way for a successor more to his mind.

mind. We quote a few lines, which show his feelings, if they do not magnify his genius for poetry:—

‘Forced from my flock I daily saw, with tears,
A stranger’s ravage two sabbatic years;
But I forbear to tell the dreadful stroke,
Which freed my sheep from their Erastian yoke.’

Yet sore as Ken felt at first about the intrusion of a successor into the diocese which he still deemed to be canonically his own, he never suffered this feeling to lead him into any formal act of separation from the national Church. To the consecration of the two bishops—Hickes and Wagstaffe—he refused to be a party: ‘My judgment,’ he wrote, ‘was always against it, and I have nothing to do with it, foreseeing that it would perpetuate a schism.’ As time ran on, he evidently grew dissatisfied with the Nonjuring position, and anxious to heal the breach. In 1700, in a letter to Hickes, he lamented the schism, ‘concerning which,’ he said, ‘I have many years had ill-abodings,’ and suggested that, to restore peace to the Church, he and the other two survivors of the deprived bishops should resign. This suggestion being declined, three years afterwards, much against the wish of the party, he formally withdrew in favour of Hooper; and, on the death of the last of the other two, he openly expressed the wish, that the breach might now be closed by the union of the seceders with the bishops in possession. Taking this saintly man altogether, it may be said that he was one of those beautiful souls which in quiet times shed lustre over the communions to which they belong, but are scarcely of the robust stuff of which leaders are made for times of crisis and revolution. Bold to stand on their conscience, strong to suffer for a scruple, they fail through timidity when the times are out of joint, and new emergencies require the adoption of courses which depart from the well-worn groove of precedent. Had Sancroft, and the three prelates who followed his lead, been like Frampton and Ken, although we could not have awarded them the praise of being equal to the guidance of the English Church through revolutionary troubles, we could with much less qualification have held them in honour as sufferers for conscience’ sake.

It is then on Sancroft, and the three bishops of Ely, Norwich, and Peterborough, that the burden of the schism rests. They could have prevented it altogether with a single word, but that word they would not speak. Had they magnanimously withdrawn their claims to their sees, when, in consequence of their refusal of the oath, the same power, which had given them jurisdiction,

diction, deprived them of it, no difficulty could have arisen about the canonical authority of their successors, and on the principles of the Nonjurors themselves no cause for secession would have existed. The whole matter would have passed away with a few petulant abstentions from the Church's public worship, or some ill-mannered gestures of dissent while the prayers for the new sovereigns were read. Even had they simply been silent, the worst that could have happened would have been an unorganized separation for the short time they had to live, instead of the hundred years of schism which their action entailed on the Church. It is for this action that we blame them, not for being scrupulously tender of their own consciences. With their antecedents they might not have been the right persons to govern the Church under the new dynasty; to make way for others might have been the better course. We would not for a moment deny that in critical epochs public men may sometimes feel themselves so deeply committed to certain views or lines of conduct, as to be morally disqualified for taking the lead in a change of front, even though circumstances convince them of its expediency. Hampered by their past, enfeebled by a dread of inconsistency, held back by scruples arising out of previous engagements, they may be pardoned, perhaps even praised, if they consider it right to resign the lead to others who have no such entanglements to break through. But a plea of this kind, available though it be to exonerate the Nonjuring prelates for incurring deprivation, is not broad enough to cover their schismatic action. To justify this, it was not sufficient to impugn the title of William and Mary; what needed to be proved was that the national Church, by acquiescing in the revolution, had departed from the faith, or violated the divine ecclesiastical order, to such a degree as to render communion with it unlawful for a Christian. But to prove that was impossible. No verse of Scripture, no tradition of the Fathers, no decree of Council or Synod, could be cited to that effect; in faith and order the Church remained exactly what it had been. This argument was very forcibly put by the learned Stillingfleet, in a sermon which he wrote for the thanksgiving day in 1694, but was prevented by illness from preaching:—

‘I would have them consider,’ he says, ‘whether there hath ever been so groundless and unreasonable a separation as they have been guilty of. I mean as to two things: i. On account of those bishops who refused to act when they were permitted and invited so to do, according to the principles of religion owned by themselves. Nothing required of them contrary to Scripture, Fathers, and Councils, or the

the Articles of our Church; nothing but what the law required as a security to the present government; and, if their consciences were not satisfied as to the giving of that, they might have retired and lived quietly. But why a separation? Where is there any precedent of this kind in the whole Christian Church? viz. of a political schism, where all the offices of religion are the same; only some are deprived for not doing what the law of the land requires; i.e. they rather chose to lose their places than to do their duties; which is a very new ground of separation and utterly unknown to the Christian Church. ii. As to the public offices of the Church with respect to their Majesties, I can find no one instance in the Greek or Latin Church, where these were scrupled to be used with respect to those who were in actual possession of the throne by the providence of God, and consent of the people.'

It was a saying of Samuel Johnson's, that, 'with the exception of Leslie, the Nonjurors could not reason.' Certain it is that the conduct of their leaders bristled with inconsistencies. They were continually straining out the gnat while they swallowed the camel. Non-resistance to the hereditary monarch was their fundamental principle, their sacred 'doctrine of the cross;' yet they were willing to accept the Prince of Orange as an armed mediator between James and the nation, and to assent to the forcible transfer of the whole regal power to William with the title of regent. Their consciences allowed them to obey William, but forbade them to recognize him. They denied his right to exercise the royal prerogatives, yet they accepted his nomination of Burnet to be bishop of Salisbury. They acknowledged the force of St. Paul's precept to pray for all who are in authority; and at the same time declared that a second absolution was needed at the end of the Church's service, to absolve the worshippers from the guilt contracted by joining in the petitions for the welfare of the actual sovereigns, William and Mary. They had accepted their diocesan jurisdiction from the civil power, and they denied the competency of the same power to withdraw it from them. They had entered on their sees under an oath imposed by the Legislature, and they protested against the right of the Legislature to require them to swear. They condemned the oath of allegiance to William and Mary as sinful, and empowered their commissaries to administer it when giving institution to benefices. They took their stand on the Church's political teaching, and repudiated the practice of the Church in the Apostolic age, when Christians never concerned themselves about the title of the Cæsar who happened to reign, but recognized each in turn, and even several at once when rivals seized the power in different provinces of the empire. Such inconsistencies were the Nemesis of the Nonjurors' impracticable

impracticable doctrine, and betrayed the intrinsic weakness of the cause for the sake of which their learning, piety, and fidelity to conscience, were lost to the Church and turned to her hurt.

Seceding bodies have a tendency to further disintegration, and the Nonjuring party was no exception to the rule. The opening of the year 1710 brought its first crisis, and happily saw the reconciliation of its more moderate and thoughtful members to the Church of their fathers. It is instructive to notice the plea by which this abandonment of their position was justified by them. Dodwell, their leader, though a layman, had maintained the necessity of the original secession on the single ground that the deprived bishops—'our invalidly deprived fathers' as he used to designate them—not having been canonically deposed continued to be the canonical bishops of their respective sees, and consequently that the bishops actually in possession were schismatical intruders. So long as a single see remained in this predicament, he held that the entire national Church, being in communion with the schismatical intruder, was schismatical by contagion, and that communion with it continued to be unlawful. But the successive deaths of Sancroft and his deprived suffragans released one see after another from the category of sees capable of communicating the contagion of schism; and when, on January 1, 1710, Lloyd, the ex-bishop of Norwich, died, Ken was the only one left, and he had surrendered his canonical right to Hooper several years before. Hence the time had come when not a single see remained in which there was both a bishop in possession and a bishop with a shadowy canonical title. From that moment, according to the view of Dodwell and his friends, the national Church became free from the schismatical infection, and the guilt of schism was transferred to the other side. Accordingly, with great satisfaction to themselves, they lost no time in re-entering the portals of the now disinfected Church. The argument was ingenious, and we can heartily rejoice that it was found sufficient by these estimable persons. At the same time we must confess, that it appears to us to afford a striking illustration of the unreality of the whole contention. When the first day of the new year dawned, the national Church was schismatical to its core, and separation from its communion was an imperative duty. Before sunset of the same day it had become the only lawful Church in the land, and separation from its communion was a sin. What had happened to produce this momentous difference? Certainly nothing in the Church itself. In the evening of that day it was precisely the same as it had been in the morning; not one iota of change had been made in its doctrine,

doctrine, its discipline, its officers, or its connection with the State. Nothing had happened except the obscure death, in a lodging at Hammersmith, of an old man who had seceded from it twenty years before. Might not common sense be pardoned for suggesting, that if so minute and entirely external an event was all that was necessary to justify a return to its communion, the previous renunciation of its communion had no sufficient cause?

Such was the opinion of the other half of the sect. They poured scorn on the weak-kneed brethren, who on so trivial an excuse had yielded to the blandishments of the apostate Establishment. To use the language of Hickes, their bishop and oracle, they 'could not imagine that such adulterous intruders can merely by the death of all those whose thrones they usurped, continuing not only impenitent, but justifying their intrusion and the pravity of their schismatical consecrations, in a moment become lawful and valid bishops of their usurped districts, and Catholic bishops of the Church.' In their eyes the prelates of the 'Revolution Church,' as they scoffingly styled it, continued to be 'anti-bishops' just as much as ever, because they professed the 'dangerous and damnable doctrines of resistance and the validity of lay-deprivation.' The true Church, they boasted, was and ever would be to the end of the world with their own 'little and faithful suffering number.' To these irreconcilables no course was logically open but to perpetuate the schism, till either they or the national Church perished; and accordingly on the death of their other bishop, Wagstaffe, who having nothing else to do had been practising as a physician, Hickes obtained the co-operation of two members of the proscribed Scotch episcopate who seem to have been in hiding in London, and with their assistance consecrated three new bishops of the schism, Collier, Howes, and Spinckes. Two years later, on the death of Hickes, these three consecrated two more, Gandy and Brett. Then discord broke out among them, and the curse of schism came home to roost. Collier and Brett, becoming dissatisfied with the Anglican Communion Office, drew up a new one on the lines of King Edward's first book, with modifications from the early liturgies; and on the refusal of the majority of the body to adopt it, they parted company with their brethren, and formed a new sect known as the 'Usagers.' For about fourteen years the two sections of Nonjurors faced each other in hostile array, each striving to perpetuate itself by fresh consecrations; but by 1733 the Usagers had managed to absorb most of the others, and there was a short-lived union. The schismatic spirit, however, although

although for a moment exorcised, soon returned reinforced. One of the party, named Lawrence, known as the author of several treatises on the 'Invalidity of Lay-baptism,' accepted consecration from the hands of a single Scotch bishop, and headed a party of Separatists, who adopted an entirely new prayer-book, drawn up by Deacon, whom Lawrence was pleased to consecrate as his coadjutor. It soon became evident that the Nonjuring cause was doomed. Discredited by its internal dissensions and the impracticable narrowness of its views, the sect dwindled in the number as well as the quality of its adherents. In 1789, Gordon, the last bishop of the regular section, died, and that branch of the schism became extinct. For nearly a score of years longer the Separatists lingered on, still playing at single-handed consecrations; 'a singular proof,' remarks Hallam, 'of that tenacity of life by which religious sects, after dwindling down through neglect, excel frogs and tortoises; and that, even when they have become almost equally cold-blooded.' But the time arrived when this remnant, too, became unable to 'drag its slow length along;' its last bishop, Boothe by name, died in Ireland in 1805, and with him the once renowned Nonjuring party passed away, unnoticed and unwept.

Having thus briefly traced the secession to its inglorious close, we turn back to particularize its more prominent members, whose ability, learning, or piety gave it somewhat of lustre in its earlier period. Next after Ken, the one most affectionately remembered by English churchmen is the layman, Robert Nelson, the gentle and devout complexion of whose character was well indicated by the epithet commonly attached to his name by his friends, who familiarly spoke of him as 'the pious Mr. Nelson.' Born in 1656, he received an Anglican education under Dr. Bull, the future Bishop of St. Davids, and was admitted to the intimate friendship of Tillotson, who actually expired in his arms after a brief tenure of the primacy. The fortune and figure of the 'handsome Englishman,' as Nelson was called by the Queen of France when in the prime of his youth he was presented at her Court, pointed him out as fitted to grace the royal circle at Whitehall, and a proposal was made to him to become attached to it by the purchase of an office; but such a Court as that of Charles II. was little to his taste, and he made the wise choice of turning his back on its gilded profligacies. His principal cross was found in his marriage; for having wedded abroad a widow considerably older than himself, Lady Theophila Lucy, he discovered too late that she had previously become a Papist. In spite, however, of the gross
deceit

deceit put upon him, and of the embarrassing fact that the married couple found themselves writing at the same time on opposite sides of the controversy with Rome, his amiable temperament enabled him to live in more than harmony with her, and for several years to watch tenderly over her declining health. At the time of the Revolution he was on the Continent, but returning in 1691 he found it necessary to make his choice between the old Church and the Nonjuring secession. To a man of his reverent and submissive spirit the dilemma was a cruel one. To desert the national communion was a sore wrench to his feelings; to remain in it, and listen to the prayers for William and Mary, was an offence to his conscience. He consulted Tillotson, and the primate had no other advice to give than to impress upon him the impropriety of being present at prayers in which he could not sincerely join. Upon this Nelson reluctantly united himself to a small Nonjuring congregation, and lived quietly in close friendship with Kettlewell, one of the most esteemed members of the party, whose gentle temper was akin to his own. Happily for the Church, after Kettlewell's death in 1795 this inaction failed to satisfy Nelson, and, without formally withdrawing from the Nonjurors, he gradually renewed his intercourse with many of the leading churchmen, in concert with whom he took a prominent part in founding the Christian Knowledge and Propagation Societies, and promoting church-building, the reformation of manners, and other charitable enterprises. In 1710 he felt himself able to return to the public worship of the old communion, and had the satisfaction of spending the remaining five years of his life in the beloved Church of his fathers. He was ready with his pen, and published several works of a religious character, which, if not brilliant or striking, are invariably thoughtful and devout. To sum him up in a phrase, he was an admirable type of the old orthodox or moderately high-church school of Anglican religion, as far removed from Romanism on one hand as from Puritanism on the other. The most popular book which he published, the 'Companion for the Festivals and Fasts,' is almost a transcript of himself, and to this day has scarcely ceased to hold the rank which it quickly attained, as a classic and almost indispensable handbook of Church of England devotion.

Next to Nelson may be placed Henry Dodwell, also a layman, who for many years was the chief adviser of the moderate section of the Nonjurors, and adorned their little communion by the vast extent of his erudition. He had the reputation of being one of the most learned men in Europe, but a portion of

his learning might have been profitably bargained away for a modicum of sober judgment and practical good sense. His faculties seemed to be overburdened by the weight of his accumulated knowledge; the fuel choked the fire rather than fed it. It was of him that King William is reported to have said, 'He has set his heart on being a martyr, and I have set mine on disappointing him.' Irish by birth, he was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and was elected to a fellowship; but being disinclined to take holy orders, he vacated it in 1666, disinterestedly declining, on the ground of public policy, to avail himself of the offer made by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, to obtain a dispensation for him. Transferring himself to England he became a literary ally of Bishop Lloyd, who occupied successively the sees of St. Asaph and Worcester, and busied himself in historical researches as well as controversial divinity. The reputation which he gradually acquired led to his election to the Camdenian Professorship of History at Oxford, at the beginning of the revolution year; but his tenure of it was short, for towards the close of 1691 he was deprived for refusing to swear allegiance to William and Mary, and retired to Cookham in Berkshire, where he spent the remaining twenty years of his life. From a 'Cautionary Discourse' which he published at the time of his deprivation, we learn that he would have had no objection to undertake to live peaceably under the new sovereigns; his difficulty was that the oath, by requiring a positive fealty and allegiance, implicitly pledged those who took it to 'maintain the life, limbs, and terrene honour of their liege lord, to keep his secrets, and discover plots against him,' services which he could not conscientiously render to a usurper. He continued, however, to attend the Church prayers until new bishops were consecrated to the sees of the deprived prelates; and even after that, with all his heat against the intruders, and his conviction that the Church had become schismatic by accepting them, he never assented to measures which were likely to prolong the secession beyond the death of the last of those in whom he believed the canonical possession to continue. As that event approached, he laboured earnestly to prepare his friends to take advantage of it; and a year before his death, he had the satisfaction, as we have seen, of carrying back with himself a large number of the seceders to the communion of the national Church.

A few personal traits of this rather remarkable man are worth recording. His simple nature was pleasantly illustrated by the circumstances of his marriage. He was in his fifty-second year when it took place, but although so late in beginning family life,

life, he showed himself as prolific of children as of books, his olive-branches mounting up to the respectable number of ten. He had in his bachelor days intended certain of his kinsmen to be his heirs; they, however, died off, and their removal appeared to him to be a call of Providence to beget heirs for himself. His friend and biographer, Mr. Brokesby, thus quaintly describes the result:—

‘Whilst he thought of this change of his condition, God happily suggested to his thoughts a person in all respects fitted for him, viz. one in whose father’s house at Cookham he had at several times tabled, and whom he had in her younger years instructed in the principles of religion, in which he found her a good proficient, and afterwards had just reason to believe that such principles had influence on her mind and conversation, and hereby fitted her for that relation. How much she was suited to his circumstances, how good a wife she was, and how careful a mother she continues to be, must not, she being yet alive, be here insisted on, lest I should be censured for a flatterer.’

In character Dodwell was irreproachable. Pious, kindly, full of good works, simple and somewhat ascetic in his habits, he entirely deserved the esteem and affection entertained towards him by his friends. What defects he had were rather in his head than his heart. Like most book-ridden recluses, he was little suited to deal with the exigencies of real life. How he lived in his books appears from his habit of making his journeys on foot, that travel might not interrupt his converse with them. For this purpose he converted himself into a walking library. Clad in a coat well furnished with convenient pockets, and stocked with volumes of a suitable size, he used to plod along the roads, drawing out now a portion of the Hebrew Bible, now a Greek Testament or a prayer book, which after a while he would exchange for a treatise of St. Augustine or some other father of the church, or for the ‘*De Imitatione*’ which was one of his especial favourites. A life of such unintermitted study, unbalanced by experience of the world and its affairs, not unnaturally exposed him to the domination of narrow or impracticable ideas. Episcopacy became a sort of monomania with him. No salvation except through bishops became the keynote of his theology. To the scandalizing of his associates this maggot in his brain attained such portentous dimensions that he wrote a book to prove the derivation of the soul’s immortality, in the case of all the heirs of eternal life, from the hands of the episcopal order. Of this extravagant work, which it certainly requires a desperate effort to get through, we give the full title as a curiosity:—

'An Epistolary Discourse, proving from the Scriptures and the first Fathers that the soul is a principle naturally mortal, but immortalized actually by the pleasure of God to punishment; or to reward, by its union with the Divine baptismal Spirit. Wherein is proved that none have the power of giving this immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only Bishops.'

By his theory of the natural mortality of the human soul, Dodwell flattered himself that he got rid of several serious theological difficulties. It seemed to him to 'clear the Catholic doctrine of original sin from exposing mankind to eternal torments for the single and personal act of Adam;' to account easily for the doctrine of reprobation; and to relieve theology from the difficulty of finding a reason 'why the sins of finite creatures should be punished with infinite penalties.' Like some in our own day, Dodwell appears to have forgotten that to deny human nature a native spiritual faculty is as good as to deny human responsibility altogether, and reduce religion to mere fatalism. To our mind there is something peculiarly grim and revolting in his defence against the charge of letting off sinners too easily. 'I do not think,' he wrote in the 'Præmonition' to the second edition, 'that any adult person whatsoever, living where Christianity is professed, and the motives of its credibility are sufficiently proposed, can hope for the benefit of actual mortality.' What he meant was, as the title of his book shows, that the souls of unbelievers, instead of being allowed to become extinct according to their natural constitution, would be miraculously endowed with the gift of imperishableness at death, for the purpose of rendering them capable of enduring endless pain. Can the vanity of speculation, we would ask, upon this inscrutable and awful subject be more forcibly shown than it is by the fact that this amiable theorist could imagine himself to be smoothing away difficulties, by flinging out with a light heart the ghastly notion, that naturally mortal souls shall be 'immortalized actually by the pleasure of God to punishment'?

Of a very different temper from Dodwell's was the next most prominent of the original Nonjurors, Dean Hicke, who had been selected, on Sancroft's recommendation, to become one of the first two bishops of the schism. He was the fire-eater of the party, pugnacious to an extreme, and fanatical enough to regard the peace of the realm and the interests of the Church at large as trifles in comparison with the maintenance of the doctrine of non-resistance. He had been a fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, from whence he was promoted to the deanery of Worcester. Of his intellectual ability and the sincerity with which he professed his extreme opinions there can be no question;

question; and especially as an Anglo-Saxon scholar, and the author of the great *Thesaurus of Northern languages*, he has left behind him a good reputation for learning. But as an ecclesiastical controversialist he was as bitter and one-sided as he was voluminous. At Tillotson he did not scruple to fling the epithet of atheist, and even Ken was dubbed by him 'a half-hearted wheedler.' On the nomination of a successor to his deanery after the time of grace for taking the oath of allegiance had expired, the world was amused by the vehement protest which he affixed to the cathedral doors, warning the chapter to beware of permitting any infringement of his legal rights. It has been embalmed in one of the satirical pamphlets which flew thickly about in those days of anonymous scribbling, entitled '*Passive Obedience in Active Resistance*,' a sentence or two of which will be enough to show its pungent flavour:—

'How he stormed, foamed, fumed, and swaggered against sovereign authority, and tore the very curtains of his stall for madness and vexation; and in what a rage he signified his vain fury to the sub-dean and the rest of the prebendaries! . . . Heavens! who could have thought that Christian, lamblike, passive obedience could have flustered and blustered and ranted and hectored at this rate!'

We have already seen how strenuously he opposed the reunion of the party with the national Church, after the death of Lloyd in 1710, and, unhappily, succeeded in persuading a moiety of it to keep up the schism. Nothing can better evince his irreconcilable temper, than the small volume which he wrote on the occasion, though not published till after his death, entitled, '*The constitution of the Catholic Church, and the nature and consequences of schism.*' In substance it consists of thirty-nine articles of ecclesiastical doctrine, enunciated in the loftiest tone of infallibility, and followed by a fortieth which declares the application of them to the existing state of things.

Among the first generation of Nonjurors a front rank must be accorded to Charles Leslie, son of an Irish bishop, and best remembered now for the small treatise of some forty pages which he wrote against the deists. In the recent biography of this acute controversialist, named at the head of our article, the reader will find ample particulars of his life and multifarious writings, but will be disappointed if he expects it to furnish him with any discriminating appreciation of its subject. Ecclesiastical pedants, who think to measure the world by patristic precedents and canonical rules, are not exactly the persons best qualified to take a large view of the affairs of nations, or of the characters and policy of statesmen, as in the
whirl

whirl and rush of human aims and passions the destinies of mankind are accomplished. If by an unkind fortune such persons should be betrayed into meddling with these high themes, narrowness and eccentricity of treatment are but too likely to ensue. Luckily for our space, Mr. Leslie has enabled us to produce in a single sentence evidence from which it is easy to judge, how far he is affected by this kind of disqualification for historical criticism. Having occasion to mention the death of William III., to whom, whatever were his faults, we suppose no sane student of history can deny that both England and Protestant Europe owe no small debt of gratitude, Mr. Leslie singles out for notice the pathetic clinging to the Earl of Portland of the dying monarch, for the purpose of hanging upon it the astonishing remark, that it 'relieved with a solitary ray of light his dark and terrible career!' We venture to submit that serious history is not to be constructed on the assumption, that a denial of the divine right of legitimacy is the one fatal heresy in politics, and to be the instrument of emancipating a nation from despotism the one unpardonable sin. If in the thick of the pressure and turmoil of our revolutionary period some shadow of an excuse for entertaining such a view might have been pleaded, it has certainly long since ceased to be available. We can feel amused when we read such slashing invective of Charles Leslie's as the following excerpt from his works: 'I now say that a Whig is not so good as a Pagan: are not these men literally heathens? They are worse than Mahometans. Your giving heed to these men, or bidding them God-speed, is directly enlisting yourselves under the banner of the devil.' But his biographer must pardon us if a somewhat different feeling is excited by the reproduction of such sentiments, now that the heat and passion of the revolution are removed from us by a couple of centuries.

On the title-page of the biography, Leslie is defined by the expression, 'Nonjuring divine.' It is true that in the Oxford edition of 1832 his theological works fill seven volumes in octavo; but all the same we should class him as a politician rather than a theologian. His mind was of the legal order, both by native complexion and by training. After graduating at Dublin, he studied law at the Temple, and was called to the English Bar. It was only want of success which took him back to Ireland several years later, where he entered into holy orders, and became a beneficed clergyman, a county magistrate, and Chancellor of the Diocese of Connor. On his return to London after being deprived for refusing the oaths, he plunged into controversy, and became celebrated as one of the hardest hitters
of

of the time. Wherever Churches, sects, or parties were contending, Leslie smelt the battle from afar, and rushed to join in the fray. His seven volumes of theology are entirely controversial, the Quakers being the foe in the larger part of them. As to their general style and temper, perhaps the less said the better. Such titles as 'The snake in the grass,' 'Satan disrobed from his disguise of light,' 'The wolf stripped of his shepherd's clothing,' savour more of the keen, satirical polemic, than the edifying divine. They are all hopelessly dead now; even the once famous 'Short and easy method with the Deists,' the tone of which is happily unexceptionable. Of this little performance it is enough to say, that it was written in consequence of a request for 'one topic of reason which should demonstrate the truth of the Christian religion;' and as only in an age when the Apologetics of faith had become mechanical and rationalistic could the enterprise of demolishing the walls of the deistic citadel by a single blast have been deemed possible, the attempt, however ingenious, was doomed to fail. The divine authority of the doctrine of Christ is certainly not to be established by the single assertion, that the two institutions of Baptism and the Eucharist may be historically traced back to the first century of our era; and in that assertion the entire substance of the 'Short and Easy Method' is contained.

Leslie's versatility as a controversialist is best shown in his periodical, the 'Rehearsal,' which for more than four years he maintained single-handed, issuing it in a small sheet at first weekly, and afterwards twice a week, till, when the 408th number was reached, a threat of prosecution brought it to an end. The title, he says, was taken from 'that most humorous and ingenious of our plays'; and its purpose was 'to unravel the more pernicious papers and pamphlets of this age,' or as he put it in his racier phrase, 'to roast the Whigs.' In this curious medley argument, sarcasm, irony, buffoonery, were poured forth with unstinted profuseness, in the dramatic form of dialogue, not without effect it would seem in stimulating disaffection towards the Revolution-settlement. At any rate Leslie began to feel the country too hot for him, and took refuge for a time in the Pretender's little court at Bar-le-duc, where he was permitted to officiate as an Anglican chaplain, and was the usual medium of communication between the Nonjurors and the exiled Stuarts. He died in Ireland in 1722, in the communion of that section of his party which adhered to the Book of Common Prayer, and rejected the 'Usages' introduced by Collier and Brett.

From the list of the original Nonjurors the name of the elder Sherlock ought not to be entirely omitted, although it was only
for

for a few months that he was associated with them. If we may judge from the howl of execration with which his speedy desertion was greeted, they must have put a very high value on his adherence to their cause. Next to their episcopal leaders, he was certainly the most conspicuous personage of the party. Having himself published a work in favour of the doctrine of non-resistance, he scrupled to acknowledge William and Mary, and incurred suspension from the Mastership of the Temple; but prior to actual deprivation he professed himself convinced by a passage in Bishop Overall's Convocation book, that the authorized Anglican doctrine included *de facto* princes among 'the powers that are ordained of God,' took the oath of allegiance, retained his office, and was shortly after promoted to the deanery of St. Paul's. One good fruit was borne by his suspension, for it produced his immensely popular 'Discourse concerning Death,' celebrated in Prior's verse:—

'Easy in words thy style, in sense sublime,
On its blest steps each age and sex may rise;
'Tis like the ladder in the patriarch's dream,
Its foot on earth, its height above the skies.
Diffused its virtue, boundless is its power,
'Tis public health and universal cure;
Of heavenly manna 'tis a second feast,
A nation's food, and all to every taste.'

A shower of lampoons celebrated his recantation, and are worth noticing, not for their intrinsic merit, but as illustrating the 'miry clay' which was mixed with the better metal of the party. Trimmer, turncoat, smock-peckt, were epithets freely flung at him, the last expressing the popular opinion, that he was bullied into swearing by his wife. 'There goes Dr. Sherlock with his reasons for taking the oath at his fingers' ends!' was the cry, as he handed her along St. Paul's Churchyard. In one of the street ballads which has escaped oblivion, he is made to recite boastfully how often he had canted, recanted, and canted again, to the chorus—

'A turncoat is a cunning man,
That cants to admiration;
And prays for any king, to gain
The people's admiration.'

Of another, entitled 'The Weasel Uncased,' an idea may be formed from this stanza:—

'His spouse, like Job's wife, to ease his heartaching,
Did press him to swear that he was mistaken,
Though some think it was for to save his bacon,
Which nobody can deny.'

Again,

Again, in a more elaborate poem, published under the title of 'The Weesils, a Satirical Fable,' he is represented as making his confession. A visitor accosts him :—

'Declare as you would merit to be blessed,
Why you refused so long, why swore at last;
Was not a female serpent in the case?
Was't not your wife?'

To which he makes answer :—

'To say the truth it was.
Profit with argument my heart did win,
Fixed my long wavering faith and drew me in;
Her flowing reasons mine in public brought,' &c.

A curious coincidence is mentioned in Noble's continuation of Granger's 'Biographical History of England.' Sherlock's son, it may be remembered, became like his father Master of the Temple, and was promoted in succession to the sees of Bangor, Salisbury, and London, and had the refusal of the primacy. Now it was just after the victory of the Boyne that the father gave in his adherence to William III.; and just after the victory at Preston that the son pronounced in favour of George I., in a sermon from the Temple pulpit, of which the benchers caustically remarked, it was a pity it had not been preached at least the Sunday before. The circumstance gave rise to the epigram :—

'As Sherlock the elder, with his *jure* divine,
Did not comply till the battle of Boyne,
So Sherlock the younger still made it a question,
Which side he would take till the battle of Preston.'

Of those who were responsible for shaping the policy of the Nonjuring party in the second generation, the palm must be awarded to Jeremy Collier, a man in whom learning was allied to wit, and both were wielded by a singularly audacious and resolute will. Being deprived of the Lectureship of Gray's Inn for refusing to take the oaths, he immediately came to the front as an assailant of the Revolution, in a smart pamphlet, 'The Desertion Discussed,' which argued that the King's flight, being the result of coercion, could not be lawfully construed as vacating the throne. For this production Collier was arrested on the charge of sedition. In 1692 he was again incarcerated, on suspicion of holding communication with the ex-King; on which occasion he showed his unyielding temper by preferring to lie in prison, rather than by giving bail to admit the authority of King William's courts of justice. Four years later he was
once

once more embroiled with the law. When Friend and Perkins were executed at Tyburn for a plot against William's life, Collier accompanied by two other Nonjuring clergymen took his place on the scaffold by their side, and at the last moment administered absolution to them with solemn imposition of hands. The audacity of this public act of defiance created an immense sensation. The two archbishops and ten of their suffragans, who happened to be at hand, issued a declaration, commenting severely on the 'irregular and scandalous proceedings.' To escape an indictment in the King's Bench for treason Collier absconded, and was outlawed, and apparently remained so till his death in 1726, the Government wisely declining to take any further notice of him. There was better work for him to do than playing at sedition. In the corruption which had infected the English drama since the Restoration, he found a far worse evil to attack than the Revolution-settlement could have been even in the most prejudiced eyes. To this combat he girded himself with all the energy of his nature, and struck a giant's blow in his '*Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage*,' published in 1698. This work, rugged in style but rich in sarcasm and pitiless in its force, together with the subsequent defences of it against Congreve and other playwrights, forms Collier's best claim to the remembrance and gratitude of posterity. His indictment was really unanswerable, and he beat the wits at their own weapons. As Johnson remarks in his '*Life of Congreve*,'—

'His onset was violent; those passages, which while they stood single had passed with little notice, when they were accumulated and exposed together, excited horror; the wise and the pious caught the alarm; and the nation wondered why it had so long suffered irreligion and licentiousness to be openly taught at the public charge. The dispute was protracted through ten years; but at last comedy grew more modest, and Collier lived to see the reward of his labour in the reformation of the theatre.'

No sooner had the defeated playwrights laid down their arms, than Collier found a new vent for his irrepressible energy in writing his many-volumed '*Ecclesiastical History*;' a work which provoked numerous attacks for its bias towards a narrow ecclesiasticism, but was on that account the stronger recommendation of him for the episcopate, when the Nonjuring communion found it expedient to proceed to fresh consecrations. But, if Collier's learning and reputation threw lustre on the little band of irreconcilables, he was none the less one of the causes of their ruin. His headstrong temper produced a new split, and alienated more than ever the sympathy of the nation from their

their cause. Their only chance of permanence lay in union and moderation ; and this Collier deliberately sacrificed to indulge his individual preference for such liturgical usages as the mixed chalice, oblation of the elements, and prayers for the dead. In vain were the remonstrances of prudence and the shafts of satire. 'The gentleman late of the communion of the Church of England, but now of his own,' went on his reckless way, dragging after him a small muster of 'Essentialists,' as the innovators were nicknamed by the conservatives, and an additional nail was driven into the Nonjurors' coffin.

A word must be given to Collier's colleague, Spinckes, raised at the same time to the episcopate, but of a very different temperament. Almost equally learned, he was far more eminent in the gentle graces of the Spirit. It is recorded of him that for thirty-nine years his good temper never once failed. Devoted to his books, over which he would pore from fourteen to sixteen hours daily, his simplicity of life was such that to escape the temptation to indulge himself with a fire during the winter, he cased in with book-shelves the chimney-piece of his study. The public were indebted to him for two very popular books : one, a compilation of prayers entitled 'The True Church of England Man's Companion for the Closet ;' the other, an original and larger work, 'The Sick Man Visited,' which treats of every topic connected with the pastor's ministrations in the chamber of sickness. This is thrown into the form of dialogue, the names of the various interlocutors being all of classical type, in accordance with the taste of the age. The sick man himself figures under the peculiarly uncouth name of Anchithanes, rather a pompous disguise for 'one near unto death.'

It was under Collier, and his other colleague, Brett, learned in liturgies, that the seceding 'Usagers,' styling themselves 'the Catholic and orthodox remnant of the British Church,' played the curious little comedy of negotiating on equal terms for an alliance with the Greek Church. One cannot but wonder that Mr. Lathbury should have treated the transaction seriously, and considered it of 'especial interest.' For any one possessed of the slightest sense of humour, we should deem it scarcely possible to peruse with gravity the documents in which the insignificant handful of sectaries coolly invites the four patriarchs of the stately and immovable communion of the East to change their faith and their liturgy, and offers them in return leave to celebrate divine service occasionally in St. Paul's according to the Greek ritual, 'if it should please God to restore the suffering Church of this island and her bishops to her

her and their just rights.' To accept that offer, whatever it might be worth, the patriarchs showed no objection; but as for any change on their side, they replied with scarcely concealed scorn,—'Our Oriental Church, the immaculate bride of the Lord, has never at any time admitted any novelty, nor will it at all allow of any.' So the matter came to nothing, as might have been foreseen from the beginning, had not the Nonjuring Usagers been hopelessly devoid of common sense in ecclesiastical matters.

It would be tedious to unearth from merited oblivion the names of the later leaders of the sect, whose minds seemed to contract *pari passu* with the contraction of their dwindling communion; but there remains one commonly ranked with them, which is too deserving of respect to be passed over, and with it we shall close our list. It is that of William Law, the author of the 'Serious Call.' In Mr. Overton's work, mentioned above, will be found the fullest and most discriminating account of this remarkable man which has yet appeared; and we can commend the volume as being of a very different calibre from the more recent 'Life of Leslie' already noticed. One thing only at the outset has struck us as curious. It is this, that the author, while continually insisting on Law's logical acumen and rigid consistency of conduct, apparently fails to see that, in becoming a Nonjuror at all, he performed the feat which has been described as turning one's back on one's self. The circumstances were these. A few months before the death of Queen Anne, Law, then a young clerical fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, preached and published a Thanksgiving sermon for the peace of Utrecht, and wound up with a flaming assertion of 'the Divinity of our sovereign's authority, and the absolute passive obedience we owe her.' Now as Law could not possibly be ignorant that Anne reigned by a parliamentary title, to the exclusion of the Pretender, who on the principles of legitimacy was the rightful sovereign; this language, strictly interpreted, could only mean that the parliamentary title had conveyed to her the divine right on which the Nonjurors took their stand, and, as a necessary consequence, had withdrawn it from the Pretender. Yet no sooner had the first George succeeded her, having exactly the same parliamentary title, than Law's conscience revolted against the oaths, and without a moment's hesitation he threw up his fellowship and his ministerial office, and retired into private life. We have his own explanation of this step, in a letter written on the occasion to his brother, but it leaves the difficulty unsolved. What he says is this:—

'What

'What can be more heinously wicked than heartily to wish the success of a person on account of his right, and at the same time in the most solemn manner, in the presence of God, and as you hope for mercy, swear that he has no right at all?'

But that the Pretender had no right is exactly what Law's recent sermon had implied, by asserting in the most emphatic terms that the right resided in Anne; and to account for his conduct we are compelled to fall back on the supposition, that his language had been moulded on the absurd Jacobite fiction, which pretended that Anne merely occupied the throne as a warming-pan for her brother, and was provisionally possessed of the divine right as his *locum tenens*.

When it has been said that Law refused to take the oaths at the accession of George I., the whole of his connection with the Nonjurors has been mentioned. He never joined himself to either section of the party, never wrote a word in their favour, never even, so far as appears, made personal acquaintance with any of them. Secession from the Established Church did not enter into his thoughts; to the end of his life he continued to attend its services with invariable regularity. Whatever weight attaches to his name, not an atom of it can be claimed for the schism. On this account it might almost be urged that he has no title to be represented in our little gallery of portraits. But he is too interesting a character to be entirely passed over; and what we shall attempt is, not to reproduce the facts of his uneventful life which Mr. Overton's work has made familiar, but with a few strokes to depict the man himself, chiefly with the view of explaining why his reputation has fallen so far below the level to which his moral and intellectual qualities seemed likely to raise it.

By natural endowment Law was eminently fitted for controversy. Whether castigating Hoadley's Low-churchism, vindicating morality against Mandeville's cynical Hobbism, or confuting Tindal's exaltation of reason at the expense of Revelation, he wielded the weapons of logic and satire with notable effect, and seldom failed to detect and pierce the weak spots in his opponent's armour. But the qualities which did such good service in demolition were less efficient in construction; and it is by building up, not by pulling down, that enduring reputation as a spiritual guide is achieved. To apply religion practically to the regulation of human life in its modern developments requires a breadth of experience and a comprehensiveness of view, which Law's secluded life denied him, and his ascetic intensity of disposition indisposed him to value. Life with us is a much larger and more complex thing than he had any idea of

of; it is not to be satisfactorily parcelled out between devotions of the closet and acts of charity, nor to be summed up in the single duty of renouncing the world. Law's master-piece, the 'Serious Call,' with all its intense earnestness, its downright precision, its lively sketches and keen satire, is a splendid failure, because by every one, except recluses, what it demands in the name of religion is at once felt to be impracticable. The model of a perfect life propounded in it is the example of those who, 'renouncing the common business and common enjoyments of life, as riches, marriage, honours and pleasures, devoted themselves to voluntary poverty, virginity, devotion, and retirement.' Even for the less aspiring, to whose weakness some indulgence is due, the demand is not abated below the imitation of those with whom 'watching and prayers, self-denial and mortification, were the common business of their lives.' No room is left for any of the great interests, political, social, artistic, scientific, which exercise and train the faculties of mankind, and are the cement and adornment of civilized life; they belong to the world and with the world they must be renounced. As the mind is to be despoiled of all its furniture, so must the body be of all its grace and ease. 'A saint genteelly dressed is as great nonsense as an apostle in an embroidered suit.' Every meal is to be an exercise of self-denial, and we are to humble our bodies every time that we are forced to feed them. The nearer a house approaches to a monastery, with its continual round of devotions, the more will it conform to the ideal of the devout life. Here is the model which Law proposes for imitation, in the sketch of Eusebia, a well-born, wealthy widow with five daughters :—

'Her family has the same regulation as a religious house, and all its orders tend to the support of a constant regular devotion. She, her daughters, and her maids, meet together at all the hours of prayer in the day, and chant psalms and other devotions, and spend the rest of their time in such good works and innocent diversions as render them fit to return to their psalms and prayers.'

The absolute sincerity, with which Law propounded his scheme of a religious life, was evinced by the endeavour to fashion his own life according to it. He remained unmarried upon principle, holding in abomination the sight of 'reverend doctors in sacerdotal robes making love to women.' One cannot help laughing at his suggestion of the incongruity there would be in our Lord's austere forerunner, John the Baptist, making 'an offering of his heart to some fine young lady of great accomplishments.' When circumstances enabled him,

after

after the end of his tutorship and residence in Mr. Gibbon's family, to form a home with two wealthy ladies at his native King's-Cliffe,* the establishment became a living embodiment of the doctrine expounded in the 'Serious Call.' Out of an income of 3000*l.* a year, one-tenth only was spent on their united wants, the remaining nine-tenths being disbursed to the last penny in charity. The hours were divided between devotion and good works. Four times a day the whole household was assembled for lengthy religious exercises, beside the attendance at the parish church on Litany days. Luxury, arts, amusements, all means of mental culture, were rigidly banished; all books even, except religious ones. Human learning was regarded as a temptation and a snare; even the arts of reading and writing were looked upon as somewhat doubtful blessings. With the rush of the great world as it swung on its way not a heart in that little circle beat in sympathy or hope. To observe with literal exactness all the precepts in the Sermon on the Mount was part of the scheme, and the result was an instructive one. When it was known that there were thousands of pounds to be given away, and that the rule 'Give to him that asketh thee' was held to be imperative, the consequences could not be doubtful. A ragged levee became a daily institution, and the village swarmed with vagabonds and impostors, until the parishioners were provoked into presenting a petition to the magistrates for the abatement of the intolerable nuisance.

Now, beautiful for simplicity and conscientiousness as the character must have been, which in the England of the eighteenth century produced such a singular phenomenon as Law's household, we cannot wonder that it has failed to secure for him any permanent recognition of his competency to be a safe guide in religion. As soon as the question is asked, What would the world be like if it were universally fashioned on his type? the case is decided against him. Granting him to have possessed every qualification for a religious teacher, except the soundness

* The Mr. Gibbon here mentioned was the grandfather of the historian. After losing most of his fortune on the bursting of the South Sea Bubble, he again became wealthy, and settled at Putney. Soon after 1720, Law entered his house as tutor to his only son, Edward, the father of the historian, and continued to reside there, as a sort of spiritual director of the household, down to the death of the old Mr. Gibbon, which took place in 1737, the year of the birth of his celebrated grandson. Besides Law's pupil, the family comprised two daughters, the future historian's aunts, and said by him to have figured in the 'Serious Call' as Miranda, the ascetic saint, and Flavia, the fashionable sinner—a statement which their youthfulness at the time when the book was written, and the author's position in the house, obviously require us to take with a great deal of qualification. The saintly one, Hester, who never married, was one of the two ladies—the other being Mrs. Hutcheson, a widow—with whom Law lived at King's Cliffe from 1743 till his death in 1761.

of judgment which has its roots in a just conception of the genius of Christianity, and a practical acquaintance with the manifold aspects of human life, that single defect was a fatal one. It ran through his whole nature, and affected his theological speculation as much as his conduct and habits. As years advanced with him it manifested itself under a new form in the spell thrown over his mind by the writings of Jacob Behmen, and in the strange theosophy which he borrowed from that extraordinary shoemaker to fill his later works. The unpractical and narrow idealist of the 'Serious Call' naturally ripened into the mystic dreamer. With all our veneration for his transparently pure and conscientious character, and our admiration of his intellectual force, we cannot impugn the justice of the instinct, which has consigned him to neglect, and turned to other quarters for guidance in the application of Christian doctrine to the manifold varieties of human life.

Of all the Nonjurors, to Law alone has it happened to have his character sketched by the pen of an almost contemporary writer of the first rank. Gibbon's description of him, in his well-known autobiography, would indeed have been more interesting if it had been framed from personal intercourse. It is very doubtful if he ever saw his father's old tutor, except possibly in infancy: for he was only six years old when Law buried himself in his cloistered life at King's Cliffe, and twenty-three when Law died there. But the family tradition in some degree made up for the lack of personal acquaintance; and as it interested him sufficiently in Law to induce him to peruse several of his works, and to regard them with less of antipathy than he must otherwise have felt for writings so alien from his own cast of mind, his judgment has a real weight, and it may, as Dean Milman says, be pronounced on the whole a fair one. The following extracts give the substance of it:—

'In our family he left the character of a worthy and pious man, who believed all that he professed, and practised all that he enjoined. . . . His last compositions are darkly tintured by the incomprehensible visions of Jacob Behmen; and his discourse on the absolute unlawfulness of stage-entertainments is sometimes quoted for a ridiculous intemperance of sentiment and language. . . . But these sallies of religious phrensy must not extinguish the praise which is due to Mr. William Law as a wit and a scholar. His argument on topics of less absurdity is specious and acute, his manner is lively, his style forcible and clear; and had not his vigorous mind been clouded with enthusiasm, he might be ranked with the most agreeable and ingenious writers of the times. . . . Mr. Law's masterwork, the 'Serious Call,' is still read as a popular and powerful book of devotion.

His

His precepts are rigid, but they are founded on the Gospel; his satire is sharp, but it is drawn from the knowledge of human life; and many of his portraits are not unworthy of La Bruyère.'

From the foregoing brief sketches of the leading English Nonjurors, it will be seen that the party, at least in its earlier days, contained, in proportion to its size, a large number of men who were estimable in character, and conspicuous for learning of a special kind. In some degree this was a natural result of the circumstances under which it came into existence. To refuse the oath of allegiance entailed sacrifices which only the conscientious were prepared to make. To be confidently persuaded that the national Church was fatally infected with heresy and schism, and must be abandoned as an unclean thing, simply because it included prelates who had accepted sees of which the Nonjuring bishops had been deprived, required a mind which had pored over the theories, traditions, and precedents of a narrow ecclesiasticism, till the sense of proportion was impaired, and the tithe of mint, anise, and cummin, loomed larger than the weightier matters of the law. That the Nonjurors were mistaken in the line which they took we have not concealed our opinion, and the Nemesis of their error overtook them in their intestine divisions, their increasing extravagances, their rapid wasting away and extinction. If they might claim to be legitimately affiliated to the particular strain of Anglican sentiment which came into fashion under the Stuarts, it is no less certain that they were out of harmony with the broad stream of English thought, both civil and religious. We could not, indeed, adopt the harsh judgment which has been pronounced against them, that they 'disappeared after doing less good, producing fewer eminent men, and leaving less permanent impression, than any other great ecclesiastical sect in English history.' The spectacle of suffering for conscience, even though the conscience be a wrong-headed one, is never without nobility and fruitfulness. The witness, too, which they bore in an era of spiritual decadence for the divine authority of the Church's ministries, has a perpetual value. Yet this, on the whole, we venture to affirm, that their best title to the gratitude of posterity is the practical *reductio ad absurdum*, unconsciously wrought out by them, of the principles, political and ecclesiastical, which bound them together as a sect, and differentiated them from the national Church of their land.

ART. III.—*Dictionary of National Biography.* Edited by Leslie Stephen. Vols. I.—X. Abbadie—Clarkson. London, 1885-7.

‘**H**ISTORY,’ says Carlyle, in his essay on Boswell’s ‘Life of Johnson,’ ‘is the essence of innumerable biographies;’ an epigrammatic remark, which, like most of Carlyle’s sayings, though true in one sense, is not so in the obvious sense. History as it is, and indeed must be written, though based on innumerable biographies, is not their essence. Of a few great men—Pericles, Cæsar, Luther, Napoleon—their lives cannot be separated or even distinguished from the history of their times; but of the minor actors in the great historical drama, the part they played was accidental rather than the essence of their life. To say that history must be based on biography is merely to utter an obvious truism; but of the thousand biographies which go to make up a single chapter of history, the essence of more than nine hundred remains untouched, contributing in no respect to, and but little affected by, the general history of the period. The departments of biography and history are and ought to be entirely distinct, and the experienced reader—to say nothing of the student—when he finds ‘The Life and Times’ as the commencement of the title of a book, knows too well that he must expect a work of which the author is ignorant alike of the distinction and of the relations between biography and history—a book filled with irrelevant matter, in order to reach the orthodox dimensions of two or three octavo volumes. To discuss at length this distinction and these relations would be foreign to the object of this paper; while to attempt anything like a concise definition of history would probably lay us open to the charge of setting down either a truism or a paradox.

The more biographical detail we can get in a history—provided it comes in naturally and harmoniously, and aids us in arriving at true conclusions as to causes and effects—the more interesting and instructive is the history. But the converse proposition is also very frequently, though not universally, the fact; the less historical matter we find in an ordinary biography, the better. We say an ordinary biography, for there are exceptions to this as to every rule; there are cases where the man can hardly be discerned through the statesman or warrior. The biography of Pericles must comprise the history of Athens from 448 to 430 B.C.; nor can we separate the later years of the life of Oliver Cromwell from the history of England. But these are rare and well-understood exceptions. It is not given to every ruler,

ruler, or to every statesman, to influence remarkably the history of his times; and even when he does so, such influence often forms the smallest fragment of his life, and affords but the slightest biographical interest or detail. The name of Queen Anne is connected with one of the brightest literary and most glorious military eras in our annals. Her personal affection for, and quarrels with, the Duchess of Marlborough and Lady Masham contributed in no small degree to the military triumphs of the reign, as well as to the disgraceful peace which terminated them; but even in these days, when biographers seem to think one fact is as important as another, and that we cannot have too much biographical detail, everything that any human being wants, or ever will want to know about the life of Queen Anne, could be compressed into as many pages as she reigned years. All beyond this must be made up either of events with which she had no more to do than the man in the moon, or—*à la* Miss Strickland—with descriptions of pageants, ceremonials, and dresses, chronicled with the precision and circumstantial detail of the 'Court Circular.'

But we are far from despising or even disparaging biographical detail; we are too thankful to get it when it is accurate. And if we are apt to laugh at those writers who treat the fact, that their hero had a new pair of shoes or caught the measles, as momentous events in his history, yet we place them on a higher platform than those writers who, like the late Hepworth Dixon, give us florid amplifications of imaginary facts, and draw from them no less imaginary conclusions; or like many authors of the present day, devote whole chapters to things which their hero might have seen or done, but of which there is not the smallest evidence that he in fact did see or do.

But it is not of biography in general that we are here about to speak. In a detailed narrative forming a work of itself, much is permitted—nay, much is required—which would be altogether out of place in an article in a biographical dictionary. Disquisitions, criticisms, anecdotes, letters, extracts from writings, speeches, analysis of books, sometimes, though rarely, general views, all find their due place in an independent work, which is intended to be (what indeed it seldom succeeds in being, if the subject is really worthy of a book) the standard history of the individual for all time. Moreover, in dealing with the greatest men, we do want to know every personal detail which we can get. A document signed by Shakspeare is a real fact in his history; and though in the case of Jean Paul we might dispense with the knowledge of the day on which he got his first braces, or of Schiller what

was the coach in which he drove to visit Goethe, yet such absurdities are but the abuse of a not unnatural wish to see and know celebrated men in their private life and natural character. Nor are the facts and details relating to the members of their families, or to unimportant events only remotely connected with them, inadmissible or uninteresting; and the Dryasdusts, who collect and ferret out such matters, though not occupying a very high place in the literary hierarchy, and laying themselves open to much deserved and more undeserved ridicule, are not wanting in utility.

In a biographical dictionary, we want first and most of all biographical details, and especially those which exhibit or illustrate the character of the man. Names, facts, and dates, are what we require. History, disquisition, views, and above all general views, are wholly out of place. Criticism, very sparingly, may be admitted, but this neither in the case of the greatest, nor of the most insignificant writers. No one goes to a biographical dictionary for a criticism on the 'Tempest' or on 'Paradise Lost'; no one wants a dissertation at all on Airay's Sermons, or cares to know whether their characteristic is 'subtle exegesis' or 'the following up of apostolic thoughts'; but a brief criticism, from which an ignorant reader may learn what to expect from the writings of Andrew Marvell, or of Archbishop Bramhall, is admissible, and will frequently be of value. There may be readers who wish to know the general nature of Blair's 'Grave,' but for a whole column to be devoted to a detailed analysis of the work is not only a disfigurement of the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' but shows an undoubted want of editorial supervision. Were every literary work of equal importance to have the like amount of space devoted to it, the fifty contemplated volumes would require multiplying at least by ten.

Carlyle's remark on History, which we have before quoted, might with some truth be applied to a biographical dictionary. It ought to be the 'essence of innumerable biographies;' and the more nearly it approaches this description, the greater will be its merits. To discuss thoroughly the question, what is to be aimed at in a perfect work of the kind, would occupy more space than could here be given to it, and would open up many disputed questions, on which there may be wide difference of opinion; but without being guilty of 'the vanity of dogmatizing,' a few general rules may be suggested which probably most of our readers will agree ought not to be neglected, however difficult it may sometimes be to apply them. First, then, a biographical dictionary should comprise every person of whom
a notice

a notice may be reasonably expected or required. Secondly, there should be a unity and evenness of treatment observed (1) in the arrangement of details, *i.e.* dates of births and deaths, parentage, marriage, children, and such like; (2) in the narrative of the material events of the life; (3) in the case of an author, of the notices and bibliography of his writings; (4) in literary criticism; (5) in citation of and references to sources and authorities. Thirdly, a due proportion should be observed not only between the length of the biographies and the relative importance of the persons treated of, but between the different articles themselves. Fourthly, lives of members of the same family should be placed and held in due relation to each other, so as to harmonize in all respects, especially with the view of avoiding repetition and contradiction. Fifthly, extreme accuracy and precision should be aimed at; vague statements and such references as to 'a modern writer' without name, title, and page, should be absolutely excluded.

The day for a general biographical dictionary is passed. For such an undertaking on the scale of the work before us five hundred volumes would not suffice; and, if we are to have in one series the lives of our own countrymen who deserve recording, we must follow the examples of Germany and Belgium (would that France would do the like), and have a 'Dictionary of National Biography.' It is not the first time that such a work has been attempted. In 1747 was commenced the 'Biographia Britannica,' intended to contain, as the title expresses, 'the lives of the most eminent persons of Great Britain and Ireland.' It was completed in 1766 in eight volumes, folio, and has remained for one hundred and thirty years the only biographical dictionary of Englishmen. If we cannot say with strict accuracy that a book in eight folios is in every one's hands, we may certainly say that it is on the shelves of every library. It is too well known, both for its merits and its defects, to every student of English history or literature, to make it necessary or fitting to notice it here, further than to say that however worthless may be its criticisms, yet for the details of the lives of many of the men of letters of the two centuries immediately before its publication it is well nigh exhaustive, and will always remain a quarry in which all future biographers must find the bulk of their material. Eleven years after the publication of the last volume a new edition was commenced; but it sank beneath its own weight, with the termination of the fifth volume and the commencement of the letter F, in 1793.* From that

* A portion of a sixth volume was printed but never issued.

time,

time, an adequate Dictionary of National Biography has been a *desideratum* in our literature.

The great defect in the 'Biographia Britannica,' considered as a Dictionary of National Biography, is the omission of hundreds of names that we want to see. The lives that are contained are in general well done, though unfortunately too much modelled as to form and arrangement on those in the dictionary of Bayle, an arrangement well adapted to his work, but not suited to a systematic biographical dictionary, which ought not to consist principally of notes and dissertations. But the 'Biographia Britannica' only professed to contain 'eminent persons;' and of course only such as in the opinion of the eighteenth century were considered eminent. Thus we find there neither Archbishop Leighton nor Speaker Lenthall, neither Sir David Lindsay nor Thomas Sackville, Earl of Dorset; while the hundreds of persons, not in any sense eminent, but in the eyes of the nineteenth century interesting, are of course omitted. To make the 'Biographia Britannica' really what its name implies, we must supplement it by many special collections, some of them of great merit, which ought not to be passed unnoticed. The greater part of a biographical dictionary is almost necessarily occupied by men of letters; and to the lives and writings of English authors several excellent works had in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries been devoted. Leland is, perhaps, the first in date and possibly in merit; yet partly owing to the fact, that his '*Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*' remained in manuscript until 1709, it has been eclipsed by the '*Scriptorum Illustrium Majoris Brytanniæ Catalogus*' of his friend John Bale, Bishop of Ossory; first printed at Ipswich in 1548, and afterwards much extended by the author during the enforced leisure of his exile, and reprinted at Basle, 1557-9, in two folios. This work must be considered as the foundation of English literary biography. It is largely based on the MS. of Leland, and contains a brief summary of the life, and a catalogue of the writings of more than fourteen hundred British authors, and is a work of stupendous industry and research. That it has numerous omissions, and perhaps still more numerous inaccuracies, is a necessity of its position as the earliest book of the kind; that the author loses no opportunity of showing his vigorous, frequently unfair, Protestantism is what those who have read his controversial works would expect; but to say, as Warton does, that 'the work was perhaps originally undertaken by Bale as a vehicle of his sentiments in religion, and is not only full of misrepresentations and partialities arising from his religious prejudices, but

of general inaccuracies proceeding from negligence or misinformation,' is an unjust, as well as a shallow and ignorant, piece of criticism. During three centuries from its appearance, it has never been superseded; it is as necessary to the student of English medieval literature as it was on the day of its publication; and it still remains, and we fear is likely to remain, the only book in which we find any notice of the lives, or any catalogue of the works, of many Englishmen who wrote before the sixteenth century. In Mr. Leslie Stephen's Dictionary we are disappointed that innumerable authors who are noticed in Bale, are not thought worthy of a niche. Respecting some of the names omitted, a diligent search would have added something to Bale's meagre account; but if nothing more can be discovered, we think the name, the locality, and the date and title of each work of every medieval writer ought to find a place in what is intended to be the standard 'Dictionary of National Biography.' Surely Richard Blyton, of whom Bale notices no less than eight works, theological and legal, William Askett, the historian of Beverley, William Alton, the doctor of the Sorbonne, William Alnwick and Martin Alnwick, the learned Franciscans, Luke Bosden, the Aristotelian, and above all, Nicholas Cantelupe, the Carmelite, are as deserving of a place in the 'Dictionary of National Biography' as the Rev. Mr. Ainger of Hampstead, whose sole claim to distinction is that 'his performance of the divine services was very impressive,' or Thomas Barrow, the Jesuit, whose only published writings are 'two sets of verses in Hebrew and Greek, in honour of two Prince Bishops of Liege,' or Alexander Baker, whose biographer can find nothing to say of him but that 'he left a manuscript in defence of the doctrine of regeneration by baptism,' or Joseph Barret, of Nottingham, who seems to have made the best of both worlds, since he was remarkable 'for his prosperity in business, and his consistent piety,' but apparently for nothing else.*

* With the article on Bale in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' we have only one fault to find—and that is a rare one—it is too brief. Both the man and his works are certainly entitled to fuller and more detailed treatment, and no one would have done this better than Professor Creighton. It is a little irritating to find, a few pages further on, the titles of more than forty-three ephemeral works by Mrs. Clara Lucas Balfour enumerated at length, and occupying an entire column; while of Bishop Bale's ninety works, space can only be found for the titles of thirteen! Nor has Bale been cited as an authority by the contributors to the Dictionary as often as we should have expected. We constantly find Pitts or Tanner or Wood referred to as the sources of the articles, and no reference to Bale, when these writers' accounts are taken entirely from him without any additions whatever. Nor have we noticed any reference to the MS. additions made by Bale to his own copy (now in the British Museum) of the 'Catalogus Scriptorum.'

The successors of Bale and Leland in the seventeenth century are numerous and meritorious. Pits, in the fragment which he published of his '*Relationes Historicae*,' has given us notices of three hundred and eighty English writers, in which he frequently supplements and corrects Bale. Writing from the Roman Catholic point of view, and as unfair and prejudiced on one side as Bale was on the other, he speaks with the utmost contempt of his predecessor; yet he has not the less profited largely, and without acknowledgment, from Bale's work. Of Leland he speaks with respect, but where he cites Leland's '*Collectanea*' it is quite clear, as Anthony à Wood has pointed out, that it is only to avoid his obligations to Bale, for he could only have known of the work of Leland from the quotations in Bale's '*Catalogus*.' The real value of the work of Pits is in its notices of the Roman Catholic writers of the reign of Elizabeth. Wharton for his collection of lives of our bishops, Dugdale for those of our chancellors and temporal barons, are names that cannot be passed over in silence, when speaking of the foundations of our great biographical collections. Nor are these the only series of lives that the seventeenth century produced. Many others, of which the '*Athenæ Oxonienses*' of Anthony à Wood is at once the most celebrated and the most valuable, were published before the end of the century, and not only formed a source from which a large number of the lives in the '*Biographia Britannica*' were drawn, but included innumerable names which we seek in vain in the great dictionary of the eighteenth century. A succession of general biographical dictionaries followed, of various shades of merit, but the best of them far inferior to the two great French biographical collections; while the only attempt at a general biographical dictionary, which should not only rival, but surpass the '*Biographie Universelle*,' that which was made by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge in 1842, met with no support from the public, and suddenly collapsed with the seventh half-volume.

A more competent editor than Mr. Stephen for a '*Dictionary of National Biography*' it would be impossible to find; his extensive knowledge of English literature, his thorough mastery of the history of English thought, his eminent critical powers, and above all his absolute fairness and impartiality when dealing with controversial topics, make him specially qualified to superintend a work of which the greatest portion must necessarily be devoted to a history of English writers; while his literary gifts enable him to set before his contributors models of what the articles of a biographical dictionary ought to be. He has told

us,

us, that it has been his aim to render every notice clear, concise, and business-like. In this he has been thoroughly successful in his own articles, and at the same time he has proved to us by his lives of Addison, Miss Austen, Bishop Berkeley, the Brontës, Burns, Bishop Butler, Byron, Carlyle, and others, that every necessary biographical detail, together with sufficient and judicious criticism, may be given in the most condensed and concise form, without the article being in any way dull, but on the contrary thoroughly readable and even entertaining. We will not say that his life of Byron in the eighth volume is absolutely the best in the Dictionary, but it would certainly be difficult to name one that surpasses it. We are indeed bound in conscience to express a doubt whether, in such a work as this, fifty columns are not too much space to be given to any one person, yet it is impossible to wish that the article had been shorter. It is literally crammed with facts and details, stated in the briefest and most concise manner possible; indeed there is hardly a single fact in Byron's life, however insignificant, that any one can want to know, which is omitted, and yet the article is eminently readable. In addition, we get a true picture of the man and his character far more just and more life-like than other more pretentious works in large volumes afford us, and the account of the portraits, editions, and authorities, is equally good.

The editor has been successful in obtaining a staff of contributors, of whom the great majority are well qualified, and many of whom have taken to heart and profited by the advice which he has given, and the rules which he has laid down; and he has been especially fortunate in obtaining as his chief assistants and sub-editors, Mr. Thompson Cooper and Mr. S. L. Lee, the former of whom has had great experience in the compilation and editing of biographical collections. Nor must we omit a word of praise to the typography and general 'get up' of the work. The printing, the correction of the press, and all that part of the arrangement of the articles and the type which devolves on the printer, have evidently received great care.

The first volume of the Dictionary, admirable as it is in many respects, and excellent as are the greater number of its articles, is however marked by some defects, almost inevitable at the outset, which have already been pointed out in several quarters. The inordinate length of some articles, the absence of proportion and of evenness of treatment, were only what might have been expected in a volume comprising eighty-three contributors. These an editor could no more reduce immediately

ately to a perfect discipline, than a general could do so with an army of recruits. But as the work has advanced, several defects have been remedied, and others have been reduced. The later volumes are open to no complaint in the matter of the length or proportion of the articles, a greater uniformity and evenness of treatment has been attained; and, in numerous ways, a more vigorous and a more effective editorial control seems to have been exercised. Mr. Stephen has curtailed the exuberance of several contributors, who in the earlier volumes showed that with abundant knowledge they had also the misfortune to hold the pen of a ready writer; who appeared to think that any one fact is of equal importance with any other fact, and some of whom occasionally indulged in rhodomontade or fine writing.

For the greater names in our history and literature the editor has been in general fortunate in obtaining the services of writers of eminence; and in several cases writers who had already attained the position of authorities upon their several subjects. No one can speak with more weight upon Alfred (as we shall venture still to call him)* than Professor Freeman and in his case, since we have for the first time a biographical article which really tells us what we want to know, and ought to know, about the great King of the West Saxons, we may pardon the non-adherence to the rules which the editor has laid down for his ordinary contributors. Bacon is also exceptionally treated, and here again the exceptional greatness of the man justifies the proceeding. Professor Gardiner gives us Bacon's life, and Professor Fowler a critical account of his works.† We incline

* Alfred, which is a household word in the English language, appears as Ælfred. We must express our regret that Mr. Leslie Stephen has marred the usefulness of the Dictionary, as a work of reference, by yielding to the pedantry of giving well-known names in the earlier period of our history under their Anglo-Saxon obsolete forms. If a reader wants an account of 'Elgiva' or 'Elfrida,' he is compelled to hunt for them under 'Ælfgifu' and 'Ælfthryth'—names of which he has probably never heard—and he is obliged to translate into English such a sentence as the following: 'On the death of Eadgar and the accession of Eadward, the stepson of Ælfthryth, the ealdorman Ælfhere,' &c.; or if he turns to the Dictionary for the names of Alfred's children, he finds the following unintelligible list: 'By his wife Ealhswith Ælfred left two sons, his successor Eadward, and Æthelward, and three daughters, Æthelflæd, Ælfthryth, and Æthelgifu.' Surely a Dictionary of *National Biography* ought to consult the wants of the nation, and not the whims of a few scholars. There is not even a cross reference from Alfred to Ælfred, but simply, 'Alf— see Ælf—'

† The only other double article (that we have noticed), that on Sir T. Brisbane, is not very successful. Nor can we conceive why it was thought necessary to have two articles on him. Surely Miss A. M. Clarke, who has treated his scientific career in a satisfactory manner, would have been competent to enumerate his military commands and to notice his unsuccessful administration of New South Wales.

to place this compound article among the most instructive in the book, though neither writer has anything to say that is new. The views which they take of the life and philosophy of Bacon have been given to the world in other works; but, unless the Dean of St. Paul's had been induced to undertake the article, no persons more competent than the two in question could be found; and we are not sorry that in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' one who like Professor Gardiner is able to take the more favourable view of Bacon's character should be the writer of his life. Professor Fowler's summary of the works and philosophical views of Bacon is all that can be desired; yet we regret that he has not added to this some references to those whom he considers the most valuable critics or exponents of the Baconian philosophy. This would certainly have enhanced the value of the article to the philosophical student. A bare reference to the Catalogue of the British Museum is far from satisfactory. Anselm, the greatest name after that of Bacon in the whole ten volumes, has received elaborate, and on the whole adequate, treatment from Canon Stephens. The details of his life are given with fulness and accuracy; yet the article would admit with advantage of some condensation in the narrative portion, and of some enlargement in the account of the writings; and it is impossible to avoid regretting that the life of the greatest man who ever sat upon the archiepiscopal throne of Canterbury, the profoundest and most original writer that had appeared in the Latin Church since St. Augustine, had not been undertaken by the one man, who alone of the biographers of Anselm has brought him before the reader as a real living person—the Dean of St. Paul's. Canon Overton writes pleasantly of Andrewes, Atterbury, Barrow, and Isaac Casaubon, though his life of the great scholar is of necessity little more than an abridgment of the late Mr. Pattison's admirable monograph.

We always learn much from the Rev. W. Hunt, even when we may not entirely agree with him. His life of Lord Brougham is admirable, doing full justice to the intellectual power, the extraordinary capacity of application, the wide range of knowledge, the excellent memory, and the ready wit of the versatile Chancellor; yet showing in their true colours his vanity, his utter want of principle, and his selfishness. Nor does the writer attempt to conceal his dislike to the unamiable character of this extraordinary man, whose misrepresentations concerning himself, his character, his ambitions and his actions, have been carefully and, so far as we can judge, with perfect fairness, sifted by Mr. Hunt, whose biography is certainly by far

far the most satisfactory of any we have seen of Lord Brougham. The article by the same writer on Falkes de Breauté is also one of special merit, and of great value to the student of mediæval history. The name of Falkes de Breauté is familiar to the readers of Matthew of Paris and of Roger of Wendover; but much of what we read is so confusing, so obviously inaccurate, and apparently so contradictory, that we doubt whether many students have obtained any true ideas on the subject of the life or actions of this remarkable military adventurer of the Middle Ages; a narrative of whose life is now for the first time written, with a detail indeed somewhat disproportioned to the importance of the man himself, but which has resulted in an article of great interest, one of the few that has a distinct and original historic value.

Mr. Stephen has done well to place lives of the same class, where it has been possible, in the same hands. Theatrical biographies were begun by the late Dutton Cook, and have been continued by Mr. Joseph Knight; our naval heroes have fallen to Professor J. K. Laughton; military men to Mr. H. Manners Chichester, and Mr. H. M. Stephens; Puritans to the Rev. Dr. Grosart, and in the later volumes to the Rev. A. Gordon; and Roman Catholics to Mr. Thompson Cooper and Mr. C. Kent. In nearly all the result has been fairly satisfactory, and in some cases especially so. The theatrical biographies are in the most competent hands possible; and much as we regret the death of Dutton Cook, there can be no doubt it has been a gain to the 'Dictionary of National Biography' that his successor should be one who is not only a thoroughly competent theatrical critic, but also a man of so much general culture as Mr. Knight; who bears in mind, what his predecessor seems entirely to have forgotten, or perhaps never knew, that though a man is an actor or a dramatist, there may be a good deal else about him worth mentioning. Several of the earlier dramatic biographies are ludicrously inadequate. Of the many excellent articles by Mr. Knight, we are disposed to give the pre-eminence in merit to that on Betterton; in which we have for the first time an accurate and consistent narrative of the life of the greatest actor of the Restoration period, with judicious criticisms taken from contemporaries on his acting, and an adequate bibliography of his works. We specially note Mr. Knight's articles, because the biographies of our actors and dramatists, whether in dictionaries, in magazines and reviews, or in more elaborate works, are full of inaccuracies; and fact and fiction are mixed together in almost hopeless confusion. With Professor Laughton's naval biographies we
have

have only two faults to find; one, that the notices of many utterly insignificant admirals and captains, particularly those recently deceased, are too long and elaborate; the other, that the professional criticisms are given with a little too much confidence—two faults which we also note in the military biographies. One of Mr. Laughton's articles, however, deserves special mention—the life of Admiral Blake. This for the present forms, and is we fear likely to do for some time to come, *the* biography of the great seaman, whose portrait is now for the first time presented to his countrymen with an approach to accuracy and completeness.* Yet we cannot but grieve that the Professor has had the ungrateful task of showing, that many of the popular stories about Blake which we have learned in our childhood are, after all, but among the mock pearls of history.

Mr. Thompson Cooper, besides writing an enormous number of meritorious notices of persons of all classes, seems to have especially taken charge of the department of Roman Catholic writers, confessors, and priests. We obtain in this department notices of a number of obscure persons, hitherto to be found only in the pages of Dodd, Oliver, and Foley. It is unnecessary to say that Mr. Thompson Cooper's articles are always written with care, that they are concise, and that the bibliographical information is both fuller and more accurate than is to be found in the three writers just named. Yet we cannot but think that an undue amount of space, having regard to their importance and interest, is given to this class of men, many of whom are wholly undistinguished; and while deserving a place in the collections of Oliver and Foley, where every priest who comes within their respective categories is mentioned, they have certainly much less claim to be admitted into a dictionary of national biography than many persons who are, not without good reason, excluded. Nor do we think that in a work which ought to be a model of accuracy in small matters as well as in great, the epithet 'Catholic' ought to be given exclusively to the bishops, priests and members of the Church of Rome without the word 'Roman' prefixed. So long as the English Church styles herself in all her formularies, and is recognized by the law as the Catholic Church in England, that title ought not to be given by way of distinction and without a qualifying adjective to the Church of Rome. We wish to speak—as we feel—of that great branch of the Christian Church and its members with the most sincere respect; we should be as unwilling to describe them by those epithets which they justly consider

* We do not forget the recent life of Blake by Mr. Hannay, which, though not without merit, is not sufficiently accurate to be satisfactory.

offensive—such as Papists or Romanists—as we should be to refer to the members of the Unitarian body as Socinians or to the Independents as Brownists; but to prefix the word Roman is in no way disrespectful, and is strictly accurate, while its omission when the word Catholic is used to distinguish members of the Church of Rome from those of the Church of England, is at once disrespectful to the Anglican Church, and offensive to a large section of its members. Still more offensive and in worse taste is the reference, in an article by Mr. Kent on James Booth, the conveyancer, to Archbishop Sharp as ‘the titular Archbishop’ of York. Nor is the language of perpetual panegyric which Mr. Cooper—and still more Mr. Kent—uses of his Roman Catholic clients entirely satisfactory; we could have wished to see a little more discrimination here, as in the case of the Puritan divines, who in the earlier volumes are commemorated with too great prolixity, and in language of unmeasured eulogy. We have amused ourselves by thinking how great would be the change—in some respects for the better—had the Roman Catholics been entrusted to Dr. Grosart, and the Puritans to Mr. Thompson Cooper. The readers would have been decidedly the gainers,* for while each of these gentlemen is disposed to exaggerate the merits of the members of his own sect, we must in candour say that we have not noticed in either of them any disposition to unfair depreciation of his religious opponents; though in every case in which their respective heroes come in hostile contact with the laws or the Church of England, the laws and the Church are always in the wrong, and the Puritan or the Roman Catholic always in the right. But some of the articles on Roman Catholic divines are open to substantial improvement. That on James Anderton, the author of the ‘Protestant’s Apology for the Roman Church,’ published under the name of *John Brereley, priest*, undoubtedly the ablest controversial work produced on the Roman side by an Englishman in the seventeenth century, is little more than a reprint of that by Thomas Watts, contained in the Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Nothing is added except the title of one book not known to Watts, whose erroneous statement is reasserted, ‘that it seems probable in spite of Dodd’s positive assertion to the contrary that James Anderton was a priest and a younger brother.’ Whatever else is doubtful, it is certain that James Anderton was a layman, and the eldest son of Christopher Anderton of Lostock. There was no *third* edition in English

* In the later volumes Mr. Cooper has written many excellent notices of Puritan divines.

of the 'Protestant's Apology.' Watts clearly misunderstood the statement of Dodd.

Among the writings attributed by Mr. Cooper to the learned Jesuit William Bathe is '*Mercurius Bilinguis*,' with the date Venice, 1659. This, like the '*Mercurius Quadrilinguis*,' is a well-known work of Scioppius, first printed under the name of Pascasius Grosippus at Milan in 1628, and reprinted, with the '*Rudimenta Grammaticæ Philosophiæ*,' at Milan in 1629.*

We cannot part from Mr. Cooper without mentioning one of his articles, not on a Roman Catholic divine, but on a worthy (or an unworthy) of more general interest. He has given us an excellent notice of George Barrington, the pickpocket, the author of some of the oftenest quoted lines in the English language:—

'True patriots we, for be it understood,
We left our country for our country's good;
No private views disgraced our generous zeal,
What urged our travels was our country's weal.'

Of the many hundreds of persons who are constantly quoting, bearing, or reading these lines, we suspect that only an infinitesimally small number know that their author was really a convicted felon transported to Botany Bay, and that they were part of a prologue to Young's tragedy '*The Revenge*,' performed by the convicts at the opening of the first theatre at Sydney in 1796. The writers in the '*Dictionary of National Biography*' have been generally and wisely sparing of poetical quotations, and have shown both good taste and appositeness on the rare occasions when they have admitted them. Where a man has written two or three specially good or celebrated lines, or where, also as in the case of Barrington, an epigram has been written upon him, which is specially pointed and witty,† we

* In the first edition no mention is made of William Bathe, but in the second, the moral sentences which form the greater part of the book are said to have been by '*Gulielmus Bateus, equestri loco in Hibernia natus et Madriti annos 1614, pie defunctus*;' in fact they are taken from the '*Janua Linguarum*' of Bathe, first printed at Salamanca in 1611. Enlarged into a '*Mercurius Quadrilinguis*,' the book was reprinted by Scioppius with his own name as the author at Basle in 1637, in two forms, in one of which the languages are Latin, German, Greek and Hebrew, while in the other Italian is substituted for German. In each edition is a preface containing a notice as well of William Bathe '*Mercurii hujus primus inventor*' as of his brother John Bathe, who, we are sorry to see, finds no *vates sacer* in the '*Dictionary of National Biography*.'

† Shortly after George Barrington's conviction, Dr. Shute Barrington, Bishop of Salisbury, was translated to the see of Durham, a circumstance which gave rise to the following epigram:—

'Two namesakes of late in a different way,
With spirit and zeal did bestir 'em;
The one was transported to Botany Bay,
And the other translated to Durham.'

may

may reasonably expect to see them quoted, and in several instances Mr. Cooper has very happily given a few lines of verse, which illustrate the character or the writings of the subject of his notice. Dr. Grosart's numerous articles are marked by his usual merits, and unfortunately his no less usual defects. They are full of information and interesting matter, but neither the accuracy nor the judgment of the writer is in proportion to his knowledge or his enthusiasm; while his exuberant and gushing style is as unsuited as can well be to the pages of a biographical dictionary. 'Thick-coming words that catch sometimes a vanishing glow, as of the light sifting through opal clouds from the vision behind of him who is at once their grand burden and informing spirit,' form part of a description of the style of a worthy Puritan commentator on Philippians, quite unworthy of a serious biographical article. Dr. Garnett's articles are marked by that delicacy of touch and thoroughly sympathetic treatment that we are accustomed to associate with his name. His notices of Aubrey, Barclay (the author of '*Argenis*'), Beckford, and that strange adventurer Alexander Blackwell, are the best, and indeed in the case of Beckford and Blackwell the only, lives we have of these persons. Mr. Tedder's lives of Acontius and Baskerville are excellent; the bibliographical information is, as we should expect, exhaustive and accurate; and in the article on Baskerville much is contained that has hitherto been unpublished and unknown.

There is no contributor whose initials we are more glad to see than Mr. S. L. Lee. We may always depend upon his accuracy and his research; but he is unfortunately one of those that hold the pen of a ready writer, and some of his articles in the earlier part of the work were of portentous length. In the more recent volumes he has succeeded in curbing his tendency to prolixity, without depriving his articles of their great value and merit; his life of Caxton may be cited as of special excellence. Mr. Lee's bibliographical information and his references to authorities leave nothing to be desired, and like Mr. A. H. Bullen and Mr. Tedder, he gives us the impression (which we are sorry to say we do not always derive from the articles in the Dictionary) that he has really referred to the books he cites.

But '*fortis Gyas fortisque Cloanthus.*' It is impossible even to enumerate all or nearly all the excellent articles. Did space admit, we would notice Professor Ward's articles on Bucer and Hugh de Balsbam (the only fault of the latter is that it is disproportionately long), and several of those by Professor Creighton and Mr. James Gairdner, which, on the other hand,

are

are disappointingly short; Professor Jebb on Bentley, Mr. Macdonnell on Bentham, Mr. Egmont Hake on Borrow, Sir Theodore Martin on Prince Albert, Rev. W. D. Macray on Sir Thomas Bodley, Mr. R. Harrison on Black of the 'Morning Chronicle,' Rev. A. Gordon on Archbishop Bramhall, Mr. Axon on Henry Ainsworth, deserve special commendation. But, indeed, there are many other articles, some dealing very briefly with insignificant persons, which are of no little merit.

In a work which already numbers nearly two hundred contributors, we find, as we should expect, every variety of treatment; and while the majority of the articles are creditable to their authors, though of various degrees of excellence, there are some which are the contrary. A general tendency to undue panegyric is a marked feature of the work, and should be guarded against in future. We have already noticed this in the articles upon divines, where the writers belong to the same religious persuasion; but it is still more marked in the lives of persons recently deceased, written apparently by admiring friends in the style of the long obituary notices which abound in our daily press. We shall not attempt the invidious task of giving a list of the cases where this has struck us; to do so would in many cases cause pain to surviving friends by seeming to hold up to undeserved ridicule persons of respectable abilities, whose misfortune it has been, that their biography has been entrusted to an admirer incapable of seeing, that the language of unmeasured eulogy is far more injurious to the reputation of the deceased than even undue severity. Moreover, in most cases the reader will himself have no difficulty in adding the *granum salis* to the 'sickly sweets of praise.' In the case of men of so much real merit as the two Barrys, the architects, it is most unfortunate for their reputation, that their lives have not been written by some one who was at least competent to distinguish between their good and their bad work, and who would not have treated every unfavourable criticism as arising from the 'rancour of malignant enemies.' The most entertaining of the *éloges* on recently deceased persons that we have noticed is that on the gentleman who, born J. C. Higgin, 'on attaining his majority dropped his patronymic,' and was thenceforth known to the world—at least to that portion of it which attends readings and lectures—as 'Montesquieu Bellew'; in which we are at a loss whether most to admire the distinctions of his birth and pedigree, his oratorical gifts, his popularity as a lecturer, reader, and preacher, or his animated presence and handsome features. His genealogy is given with amusing pomp and unusual detail. Of his mother

we are told that she was 'co-heiress under the will of her uncle Major-General Bellew, heir-at-law to the O'Briens, Earls of Thomond,' and that he (Montesquieu Bellew) was 'descended maternally from the senior branch of the O'Briens, and thus a descendant from Teige, the second brother of Donough the fourth Earl (commonly spoken of as the great Earl in Irish history), brother of Daniel, the first Viscount Clare.' The writer evidently uses the words *co-heir* and *heir-at-law* without the faintest appreciation of their meaning, while if there is one fact certain in the pedigree of the O'Briens, it is that no descendant of Teige could by any possibility be heir-at-law of the Earls of Thomond, since many descendants of his elder brother Donough still exist.

Other biographies of recently deceased persons seem based on epitaphs in the style of the famous one on Lady O'Looney. Surely the following must be from a mural tablet:

'She was a lady of excellent virtues, and her accomplishments included Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, with some Swedish and German. In geology she had especial delight. In botany she was proficient. . . . In music she was as skilful in composition as in execution, and yet she did not neglect domestic duties.'

The pages of the Dictionary, where space is so important, should not be stuffed with rubbish of this kind. Undue length is another fault which requires guarding against in the case of the biographies of recently deceased persons. It is one which, instead of diminishing as the work proceeds, seems rather to increase, and, unless resolutely put a stop to, threatens the symmetry of the work, and will upset the calculations of the editor as to the number of the volumes required. Out of four hundred and fifty-three pages that the seventh volume comprises, no less than ninety are devoted to persons who have died since 1850.

We have seen it remarked, with something like amused surprise, that the first name in a Dictionary of English Biography should be that of a foreigner, *Jacques Abbadie*. No such work could be complete without including numbers of foreign soldiers, scholars, divines, painters, sculptors, and men of science, to whom England has given a hospitable welcome, which they have abundantly repaid by associating themselves with, and adding in their several ways to, the glories of their adopted country. Dangerous as it is to prophesy unless you know, we think we shall not run much risk of turning out a false prophet, if we predict that as the Dictionary begins with a Frenchman, so it will end with an Italian—Zuccarelli—and

will thus illustrate the cosmopolitan character of our nation. Several of the articles dealing with foreign scholars are deserving of high praise; but in others, as well as in the notices of Englishmen and Scotchmen who studied or lectured abroad in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, no attempt seems to have been made to examine the many recently published French works, which give us much original and important information respecting them. The lives of these men constitute, we think, the weakest and most unsatisfactory portion of the 'Dictionary of National Biography.' No article on a French Protestant refugee can pretend to be adequate or accurate unless the monumental work, originally undertaken by Messrs. Haag, of which the second and much enlarged edition is now appearing under the editorship of M. H. Bordier, '*La France Protestante*,' has been consulted. Several contributors to the Dictionary have indeed availed themselves of this work, and have thereby greatly added to the utility and accuracy of their articles; but others are clearly quite ignorant of its existence, or worse still, have been too indolent or too careless to refer to it.* The writer of the life of J. A. Blondel is unable to give the year of his birth; he would have found it (1665) in '*La France Protestante*.' Canon Overton does not even know the Christian names of Meric Casaubon, and though he professes to give a complete list of Meric's works, he omits at least four, which he would have found in the same work. We have not noticed a single reference to the '*Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire Protestante de la France*,' which has now reached its thirty-sixth volume, nor to M. Francisque Michel's well-known work, '*Les Ecossais en France, les Français en Ecosse*.' The life of Robert Balfour, the celebrated Scotch physician and philologist, is at once inadequate and full of errors. Ignorance of the interesting notice of him contained in M. Tamizey de Larroque's '*Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Florimond de Raymond*' may be pardonable, but in writing the life of a Scotch professor in the College of Guyenne, one would have supposed that '*Les Ecossais en France*,' and Gaullieur's '*Histoire du Collège de Guyenne*,'†

* At present the new edition of '*La France Protestante*' is well ahead of the Dictionary of National Biography, having (with the end of its fifth volume) finished the letter D, and the writers in the Dictionary may therefore for some time avail themselves of it. But alas! M. Bordier proceeds at a much slower pace than Mr. Stephen, and will soon be overtaken; these five volumes have been ten years in appearing. The first half-volume came out in 1876.

† M. Gaullieur devotes nearly an entire chapter to Robert Balfour, and gives much information respecting him drawn from the MS. Archives of the City of Bordeaux.

would have been among the first books referred to. Had this been done, we should not have been told that 'probably in 1586 Balfour was appointed principal of the College,' when in fact he was not appointed principal until about 1600, certainly not before 1599; nor would it have been added that 'it appears that he was living in 1625,' when he died in 1621. His commentaries upon the *Organon* of Aristotle were printed not in 1618, but in 1616. We trust when the letter H is arrived at, William Heygate, Balfour's successor as principal of the College of Guyenne, may be more fortunate. Nor has his pupil Thomas Barclay, professor at Toulouse and Poitiers, fared much better. For his life, Irving's '*Lives of Scottish Writers*,' and Dempster's '*Historia Ecclesiastica*,' are solely relied upon, though the two modern French books just referred to, besides several others relating to Toulouse, Bordeaux, and Poitiers, would have given much additional as well as more accurate information. The interesting notice of Mark Alexander Boyd does not even mention the fact that he was a professor at Bordeaux, or that the original editions of his poems were printed there. Mr. Æneas Mackay's elaborate life of George Buchanan is also quite inadequate for that part of Buchanan's life which was spent in France and Portugal. Mr. Mackay seems quite unacquainted with anything printed in France of late years; and where his article treats of Frenchmen, it is disfigured by such errors—misprints perhaps—as *Melinde* de St. Gelais, and Beza's *Irones*; nor if he had known anything of Jacques de Teyve, or of Jean de Tartas, except what he found in Buchanan's epigrams, would he have written of them as *Tevius*, and *Tartæus*. Had he referred to the work of M. Gaullieur, he would have learned that Buchanan's retirement from Bordeaux was owing to the persecution of Cardinal Beaton, who wrote to the Archbishop of Bordeaux, describing him as a heretic, who was spreading in the College of Guyenne horrible doctrines; nor would he have failed to add the interesting but lately discovered fact, that the heretical professor found an asylum in the family of one of his youngest pupils, the son of Pierre Eyquem, Seigneur de Montaigne. For the life of John Cameron (1579–1625) no French author more recent than Bayle is cited. The long life and list of his works in the second edition of '*La France Protestante*,' and the original letters written by him to Du Plessis Mornay, given for the first time in the '*Bulletin*' (vol. xxiii.), are evidently unknown to the writer of the article, who, in merely copying second-hand the list of Cameron's works, without any personal examination of the books themselves, has fallen into the mistake of giving the

'Myrothecium

'Myrothecium Evangelicum' and the *Tà σωζόμενα* as separate and independent books, when they are only reprints of portions of the 'Prælectiones,' though in the case of the *Tà σωζόμενα* with some additions. But it is not only the more modern French works that are systematically neglected by the contributors to the Dictionary; we have not noticed a single reference to Moreri. One of the most distinguished Irish Roman Catholic clergy of the seventeenth century was Redmond or Raymond Caron. The sole authority cited for his life in the Dictionary is 'Ware's Works (Harris)' (*sic*). The writer has not even taken the trouble to refer to any of the great biographical collections, which contain fuller and more accurate notices than that in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' though curiously enough, none of those that we have looked at refer to what is really the original source of all the lives of Caron—the article in the later editions of Moreri—compiled by the editors from original manuscript sources, an interesting and full life, from which all subsequent writers have borrowed their accounts. The list of the works of Caron given in the 'Dictionary of National Biography' is a singular instance of the play of 'Hamlet' with the part of Hamlet omitted. Four comparatively insignificant works are enumerated, the title of one and the date of another being inaccurately given; but the great work upon which the reputation of Caron rests, the 'Remonstrantia Hibernorum contra Lovanienses' (fo. 1665), is wholly omitted, though it is not only a work of learning and merit, but sought for by collectors on account of its rarity, the greater portion of the impression having been burnt in the Fire of London. It is clear that not one of the most ordinary books of reference has been referred to for the compilation of this article.

Our medieval philosophers are not always satisfactorily treated. Surely Alexander of Hales, after Roger Bacon the greatest Englishman of the thirteenth century, deserves something more than the disparaging notice which he receives from Professor Adamson, who in dealing with the irrefragable doctor displays neither the philosophical insight nor the accuracy which distinguishes his article on Roger Bacon. Indeed he seems to know nothing of Alexander of Hales or his writings, save the contemptuous remarks made upon him by his great rival. Professor Rosmini Serbati holds a very different opinion of the learning and acuteness displayed in what Mr. Adamson calls the 'operose' work of Alexander of Hales. The treatment of Alan of the Isles, 'doctor universalis,'

'Qui duo qui septem qui totum scibile scivit,'

is

is even less satisfactory, and much inferior to the article on the same philosopher by the Rev. J. C. Means in the Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, an article which should at least have been referred to as the best English notice of Alan de Insulis. The facts of the life of Archbishop Bradwardine 'doctor profundus,' are given with sufficient detail, but the account of his works is meagre, inaccurate, and misleading. It is clear that the writer has not looked into any of them except the 'De causa Dei,' and has referred neither to Bale, Fabricius, Panzer, nor Brunet, each of whom gives important information respecting the writings of Bradwardine and their editions. John Baconthorpe, 'doctor resolutus,' and Walter Burley, 'doctor planus et perspicuus,' receive more satisfactory treatment from Mr. T. A. Archer, to whose article on Burley, a valuable note referring to the authorities for his life and the best accounts and criticisms of his philosophical opinions is appended.

If we enquire to what extent the rules have been followed, which in the earlier part of this paper we ventured to suggest as important in a biographical dictionary, we shall find that it seems to have been intended that somewhat similar rules should be observed, though the intention is not uniformly successful. In the application of the first rule, however, we find ourselves completely at issue with the editor. At the risk of seeming ungracious and unduly self-confident, we are obliged to repeat, what has already been said in the 'Quarterly Review,'* that we are unable to agree with the view taken by Mr. Stephen. We are most grateful for information about numberless names which are to be found in no other book of reference, but we had hoped that the decision as to obscure names would have been reconsidered. We must again submit that the greatest value of a biographical dictionary is not for the lives of the greatest men, but of comparatively obscure persons. No one has the least difficulty in learning all that he wants to know concerning our great writers and our great statesmen, but what is especially wanted is a book of reference for less-known men, principally authors; and we cannot but think that the value of the book would have been much enhanced, if the editor had inserted up to a certain date the name of every English writer, however insignificant and however little was known of him. 'If nothing is known of John Smith,' wrote Mr. Leslie Stephen in the 'Athenæum,' 'except the bare fact that he published a pamphlet, he belongs in my opinion to the bibliographer not the biographer; as soon as something

* See 'Quarterly Review,' vol. 157, p. 226, and foll.

more is known of him, he has some claim to a place in a biographical dictionary.' It was pointed out in the 'Quarterly Review,' that this rule, while it excluded a large number of authors of early date, would admit every writer of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries however insignificant, since of nearly every one much more is or can be known than the mere fact that he published a pamphlet. Mr. Stephen has found it impracticable, as it was then shown that he certainly would do, to carry out his rule, and to include all modern writers, about whom more is known than this mere fact; but while he has narrowed his rule in this respect, he has not enlarged it, as we hoped he would do, in respect of our earlier writers. We still think that every author, who lived before a certain date, which we should be disposed to place about the end of the seventeenth century, is deserving of a niche in a National Biographical Dictionary; his name, his probable date, the title of his book, and the fact that nothing more can be discovered about him, gives the very information which we require. Any person who will consult the letters A, B and C in Lowndes, in Watt, in the British Museum printed Catalogue of English books before 1640, or indeed who will take any catalogue of a large collection of English books, will find innumerable persons omitted, who are in every point of view as important and as worthy of mention as many of those recorded. Coming down to the eighteenth century, it would of course be impossible to insert the names of every writer of an insignificant pamphlet, even though, as in the great majority of cases, ample materials exist for a biographical notice; but here, as in the earlier part, we have failed entirely to arrive at any conclusion as to the grounds on which some names are inserted and others omitted. Anglican and dissenting divines, distinguished by a single funeral sermon, Roman Catholic priests, even thus undistinguished, provincial architects who have erected some single ugly church or uglier mansion, physicians who 'attained to no great fame or practice,' are to be found in abundance, while many writers of substantial volumes, and these of no inconsiderable merit, are omitted.

No dictionary of biography can be complete, or entitled to the epithet *National*, until the Catalogue of the British Museum has been gone through—we do not say necessarily by the editor, but by some one in whom he has confidence—and the claim of every English writer who appears there has been duly weighed and considered. But we doubt if this has been done; or even if the 'Bibliotheca' of Watt, or the 'Manual' of Lowndes, has been carefully examined for this purpose. We confess that on this

this point we are grievously disappointed, and we again appeal to the editor to reconsider the matter for the future volumes, so that the appropriate motto for the Dictionary may not be, as it certainly is now, 'One shall be taken and another left.'

What lives of official persons ought to be inserted is again a matter of difficulty. There are some who, however personally insignificant, must be included. Our kings and queens will appear as a matter of course, but with princes and princesses questions at once arise. There are two intelligible principles, either of which might reasonably be adopted: every son and daughter of each of our sovereigns might have an extremely brief notice (except in the rare cases where they achieved any personal distinction), merely stating the parentage, the dates of birth and death, their marriages, and any offices they held; or, those alone might be inserted who were either of personal interest or importance, or who played a part in some conspicuous event. Neither of these principles has been adopted. The lives of the most insignificant of the children of George III., the Princesses Amelia and Augusta, are narrated with as much detail as possible, yet of neither of these illustrious ladies has their biographer been able to discover a single fact of the smallest interest. But the daughters of George II., and the wife and daughter of Frederick, Prince of Wales, are completely ignored. Surely Augusta, Princess of Wales, the mother of George III., the friend of Lord Bute, the heroine of numerous stories (more or less apocryphal), deserves at least as much space as her two granddaughters; while the lives of Augusta, Duchess of Brunswick, and Amelia (Princess Royal, Princess of Orange) were certainly not made up of the trivialities forming those of the two daughters of George III.

With regard to the English judges of the superior courts, the intention seems to be to notice each, with the exception of a very few early and insignificant persons, as to whose offices there may perhaps be some doubt.* This is a tangible rule, with which no fault can be found, and which, with Foss's excellent work as a quarry, will save much trouble to the editor. The greater number of the articles on the judges are little more than abridgments or adaptations from Mr. Foss's book; in some cases with no additional matter. This could hardly

* The only omission we have noticed among modern judges is Mr. Justice Archibald. Another lawyer of an almost identical name, whose books have run through countless editions, is also omitted—J. F. Archbold. The omissions are the more singular, as both names appear in the list of those proposed to be inserted under A, which was printed when the work was first contemplated. But, indeed, there are several other names included in this list, as well as in subsequent lists, which we have vainly searched for in the Dictionary.

be avoided, and we have no fault to find with it, when 'Foss's Judges' is cited among the authorities; but we are sorry to notice a considerable number of articles, with no additional matter to that contained in Foss, with many sentences in exactly the same or very slightly altered words, in which his name is never mentioned. We can hardly imagine that the lives of Sir Robert de Bealknap, Elias de Beckingham, the two Michael Belets, and John Beaumont, to take merely a few of the names we have looked at in the first half of the fourth volume, can have been written without any reference to Foss, yet his name does not appear in the list of authorities for any one of these lives. The notices of most of the Scottish judges are taken almost verbatim from Brunton and Haig's 'Senators of the College of Justice;' but we cannot guess what has been the principle adopted, which has admitted such absolutely insignificant personages as William Baillie, Lord Polkemet, and William Baillie, Lord Provand, in preference to George Brown, Lord Colston, Robert Bruce, Lord Kennet, and many others, of whom some at least were in all respects of more importance than Lord Polkemet. The bishops are treated with less consideration than the judges, though the average bishop has been a person of more mark than the average judge. All the archbishops of Canterbury, indeed find a place; but of the other prelates, a considerable number are unnoticed as being, we presume, too insignificant. If all were not to be inserted, the selection seems in general to be judiciously made, yet we are surprised at the omission of William Booth, Archbishop of York from 1452 to 1464, which we think can only be accounted for by an oversight. Among the Scotch bishops, the only name of mark whose absence we have noticed is that of John Abernethy, Bishop of Caithness, whose 'Christian and heavenly treatise containing physic for the soul,' which reached at least three editions in the seventeenth century, should have entitled its author to at least a few lines.

In regard to the second of our rules, we are glad to see an increased unity and evenness of treatment as the work proceeds. The first volume, as was perhaps almost inevitable, was signally wanting in this respect; but notwithstanding the improvement of the recent volumes, a greater uniformity in the arrangement of details might be adopted. It is, indeed, an advantage to have, as the Dictionary *generally* gives us, the date of birth and death at the beginning of each article immediately following the name of the person in question. That it is in every case necessary to state the place of birth, the parentage, the marriage, the children, and the place and circumstances of death, we will not say; but

in

in the more important articles these are all necessary, and there are few minor points that would so greatly add to the convenience of those who consult the work, if all these facts could be found in a fixed part of the article, either at the beginning, or, as to some of them, at the end. An arrangement, by which we could know in what part of the article to look for these facts, and in the case of statesmen, lawyers, ecclesiastics, and some others, for the offices they held, and the dates of their appointments, would be a great boon and a saving of time and trouble to the reader, to say nothing of an occasional saving of temper. But the dates of birth and death are not always given, even when they could have been ascertained by a little trouble on the part of the writer of the article. Nor when given are they always accurate. The date of the birth of Robert Bertie, the first Earl of Lindsey, is placed ten years too early (in 1572 instead of 1582), and that of Montague, second Earl, several years too late.*

We hardly know anything that is of more importance than this of accuracy in dates, nor anything that requires so much minute care in the correction of the press. It has even escaped the editor's notice that, in his article on Bishop Butler, 1741, instead of 1750, is given as the date of the offer of the Bishopric of Durham to Butler. It may be thought indeed that this is a mere trifle, but Mr. Hunt, usually so accurate and careful, affords an amusing instance of the importance of not mistaking a 6 for an 0. He gives the well-known story of the first Duke of St. Albans:—

‘It is said that one day when the King was with Nell Gwynn she called to the child, “Come hither, you little bastard, and speak to your father.” “Nay, Nelly,” said the King, “do not give the child such a name.” “Your Majesty,” she answered, “has given me no other name by which I may call him.” Upon this the King gave him the name of Beauclerk, and created him Earl of Burford.’

and he then adds that, ‘the story can scarcely be accurately told, for the child was created Baron Heddington and Earl of Burford, both in Oxfordshire, before the end of 1670, the year of his birth.’ In fact it was in 1676, not in 1670, that the boy was created Earl of Burford.

By far the greater part of the Dictionary, fully three-fourths we should say, is and must be taken up by the lives of authors. In what way their writings are to be dealt with is a matter of

* Montague, second Earl of Lindsey, was certainly born six or seven years earlier than 1608, the date (it is true with a query annexed) given in the Dictionary. He was made a Knight of the Bath in 1616, and was M.P. for Lincolnshire in 1624.

difficulty,

difficulty, and while as far as possible an evenness of treatment is to be desired, it obviously cannot in every case be obtained. But on this point we cannot think the editor has been successful (has he even attempted to be so?) in putting before his contributors any convenient and well-considered scheme or plan; though in this, as in most other points, he has set them an example, which they would do well to follow. In each case where a book is mentioned, its title and the date of its publication should be given; in the case of a scarce book a reference should be made to some library where a copy can be found, or if this cannot be done the authority for its existence should be stated; where it has run through more than one edition, the number of these, and in the more important cases, the date of each; but in every case the date of the last should be stated. The more important works of each author, and in the case of great writers every work, should be enumerated; but to fill up the pages of the Dictionary, at the discretion or indiscretion of the contributors, with long lists of unimportant modern pamphlets and tracts, like the sixteen works of the Rev. John Brown of Whitburn, or the twenty-two of the Rev. Jabez Burns, is irritating to the reader when he finds that (presumably) the want of space does not allow of the enumeration of the works of Hugh Broughton, of Bernard André, or of Gilbert Burnet. In every case, when the complete list is not included, references should be given to the best catalogues to be found of the writings of the person treated of; not merely, as is occasionally done, to the Catalogue of the British Museum, but, where it is possible, to some printed book which may be easy of access. If we could ensure the criticisms being equal to those of the editor, we should desire to have them in every case; but when we find sentences such as we have quoted on Airay's Sermons doing duty as criticisms, we think that original criticism would be better avoided, and references given instead to the best critical estimates of the books in question. The authorities for and sources of each article should be given as fully, and in as uniform a manner as possible, partly for the purpose of verification, and still more with a view of enabling the reader to investigate for himself the life in question. And here we desire to express our gratitude for the enormous number of biographical and bibliographical references which we find appended to the articles, and which are certainly among the most important and valuable features of the book. Access is now afforded to an amount of information in the way of reference, which is to be found gathered together nowhere else, and which no one person could

could possibly collect for himself. Yet even these might be improved by method and order. Original sources should be indicated as such; manuscripts and private information should never be referred to for matter which is to be found in print; books which contain only a repetition of what is to be found in some earlier work, should be sparingly mentioned, and always with an intimation that they add nothing to the information given by their predecessors; reviews and magazine articles, on the other hand, should always be cited, when, as is often the case, they contain matter not to be found elsewhere. But there are certain books which we think the editor ought to require his contributors invariably to consult. Probably no one would think of writing the life of any person, of whom a notice is contained in the 'Biographia Britannica' without referring to that work, but we have hardly ever noticed references to the 'General Dictionary, Historical and Critical' (1734, 10 vols. fol.), which is the original foundation for the lives of a large number of noteworthy Englishmen. For bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, Le Neve ought always to be consulted; and for men of letters, Bohn's edition of Lowndes' 'Manual,' Watt's 'Bibliotheca,' the index volumes of 'Notes and Queries,' and the Catalogue of the British Museum. It is in the treatment of the bibliographical information, and of the authorities, that we find the greatest inequalities; and it is here that we expect, but do not always find, traces of the editorial sceptre.

Faulty as was in many respects the editing of the 'Biographie Universelle,' the skill, with which the lives of different members of the same family were treated and held in relation to each other, has often struck us as specially admirable, and in this respect the earlier volumes of the 'Dictionary of National Biography' were very defective. But this is one of the points on which great improvement has taken place in the later volumes, though occasionally some little repetition and even contradiction would have been avoided, had the lives of all the members of the same family been carefully revised by some one person. The Berkeleys are treated with exceptional favour. Not only is there an article of upwards of seven columns on the family generally, from the competent pen of Mr. Hunt, but no less than fifteen members of the family (besides the Bishop) have notices, some of considerable, and, as it seems to us, undue length. Whether it is desirable in a biographical dictionary to have genealogical articles is certainly questionable. The Arundells, the Bassetts, the Berkeleys, and the Boscauwens, are the

the only families,* so far as we have noticed, that are so treated. The articles are judiciously done, but we entirely fail to see any reason why this distinction should be conferred on these families, and not extended to the Beauforts, the Bohuns, the Beauchamps, and many others. The majority of the persons named in the general article are wholly without biographical interest or importance, yet to several of these a special memoir is also given. Surely all that was necessary to be said of the eighth and thirteenth Barons Berkeley, and of George son of the second Earl, should have been included in the general notice on the family.

But in the treatment of the less conspicuous members of the peerage generally, we have utterly failed to find any guiding principle except the caprice of the contributors. Why are so many barons of Cantelupe, and other members of the family favoured with articles, while no single baron of Astley, or of Badlesmere, not even Guncelin, so important a personage in the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I., is mentioned? Numerous barons who played far more conspicuous parts than any of the Cantelupes, except the chancellors and the bishop, are wholly omitted. We do not complain in itself, *either* of the omission of these persons, *or* the insertion of those, though in our opinion a Peerage is the proper place for them all; but we do complain of the absence of any well-considered rule or guiding principle, and we also regret the omission of names far more important, and of more interest, than many of those for whom a place is found.

The great importance of precise and exact statement cannot be too strongly insisted upon. This seems to have been generally, but by no means universally, borne in mind by the contributors to the Dictionary. The notice of Henry Nugent Bell, the genealogist, is one of those written in that vague and inexact manner, which is so irritating to any one consulting a work of this kind. 'It is said' and 'if we may credit a common report,' are modes of introducing facts or fictions (in this case the latter) which ought never to be allowed, when no authority for the 'said' or the 'report' is given. The circumstances attending the tragic death of Bell, instead of being referred to as 'narrated in the journals of the day,' should either have been briefly stated, or mention made of the journals (with dates) which narrate them. Consideration for Bell cannot have been the motive for the writer's reticence, since he actually quotes Lady

* There is also a brief article on the Beks, with the view of preventing the confusion between members of the family of the same Christian names.

Anne

Anne Hamilton's apocryphal 'Secret History of the Court of England,' for the allegation that Bell 'with other minions was delegated by Lord Sidmouth in 1819 to incite the starving people of Manchester against the Ministry, and by their means the meeting of the 16th of August was convoked which led to the massacre of Peterloo.' We are surprised that any contributor should seriously quote Lady Anne Hamilton, still more that the editor should allow such a quotation to pass. If Lady Anne is to be relied on as an authority, we shall expect in subsequent volumes to see the writings of the Princess Olive of Cumberland, or Reynolds' 'Mysteries of the Court of London' cited as authentic history. Again, in the notice of John Boyle, Bishop of Cork, we are told that he 'is stated to have been dean of Lichfield in 1610.' This is a statement which the writer could easily have verified had he taken the trouble to refer to Le Neve or any other common book containing a list of the deans of Lichfield. He would then have discovered that John Boyle was never dean, but was only *prebendary* of Lichfield. But when we meet with 'it is stated' or any similar form of words without any authority given, we are pretty safe in assuming that what 'is stated' is the contrary of the fact.

Among the minor details in which exactness is indispensable, and where there can be no excuse for inaccuracy, are the references to the rank and titles of the persons noticed, and matters of heraldry and genealogy. As the rules relating to all these are perfectly well defined and well known, there is no excuse for haziness or inaccuracy of language respecting them. Wherever either of these occurs, it implies that the writer is either too ignorant to know the commonest books of reference, or too indolent to make use of them. There can hardly be a more ludicrous or ostentatious display of ignorance on a small matter than to describe a knight's widow as *Dame* Barry without inserting the lady's christian name. But if the subject of any article receives any title, the fact with the date ought certainly to be stated. Sir James Hunter Blair probably thought that the most important event of his life was his creation as a baronet, yet this fact is not referred to in the article devoted to him. Sir Egerton Brydges is stated to have accepted 'the Knighthood of the Swedish Order of St. Joachim.' The so-called 'equestrian, secular, and chapteral order of St. Joachim,' was not a Swedish Order, but was instituted by the younger members of some princely houses in Germany; and when it was conferred upon Sir Egerton Brydges, a certain Count of Westenburg-Leiningen held the office of Grand Master, while an Englishman, Levett Hanson by name, managed the affairs of the

the order, carrying about with him to various cities of Europe its chancery and archives. It was well understood that the order would be conferred upon any person who deposited a certain sum of money to the account of Sir Levett Hanson, K.J., at a banking-house in Pall Mall. The writer of the article goes on to say that Sir Egerton Brydges thenceforward 'styled himself *Sir*, though, of course, *without heraldic propriety*.' The impropriety was in no sense 'heraldic,' but as Mr. Beltz pointed out in his review of the Chandos Peerage case, consisted in the fact that Sir Egerton styled himself '*Sir*,' in virtue 'of a distinction not conferred by a sovereign prince, and for the reception of which he had received no licence from his own sovereign.'

If we have called attention, perhaps at undue length, to what appear to us to be the shortcomings of the work, it is in no spirit of captious fault-finding, nor with any desire to make a cheap parade of pretended erudition, by pointing out faults * which must inevitably occur in such an undertaking, and many of which may be discovered by aid of the references contained in the volumes themselves. And the more perfect and full the references, the more easy by their means to pick holes, and thus to seethe the kid in its mother's milk. The perusal, or even the turning over the pages of this mass of valuable and well-arranged biographical, bibliographical, literary, and historical matter, even though here and there one may notice an inaccuracy or an omission, can only chastise a man's conceit of his own attainments, and show him, if he is not absolutely blinded by vanity, how infinitesimally small his real knowledge is, how innumerable are the authors of great reputation and of merit proportioned to their fame, of whose writings he has not read ten pages, and of the subjects of which he is absolutely ignorant. It will, perhaps, as effectually as anything, teach a man 'that truest kind of knowledge—the knowledge of his own ignorance.' 'A perfect piece of criticism,' says Landor, 'must exhibit *where* a work is good or bad; *why* it is good or bad; in *what degree* it is good or bad.' The aim of our criticisms has been to indicate what such a work might be and ought to be, to point out the general character of the book before us, and of what seem to us its shortcomings, and to illustrate them by

* We have not attempted either to present a list of the errata which have been pointed out elsewhere, or those which we have ourselves remarked, but have only noticed such as illustrate our general argument. But we would call attention to the long lists of errata and additions given in 'Notes and Queries,' 6th S. xi. pp. 105, 443; xii. p. 321; 7th S. i. pp. 25, 82, 342, 376; ii. pp. 102, 324, 355; iii. p. 101.

examples;

examples; and this in the hope that each future volume may be more perfect than its predecessors, and that the work when complete may become, what it bids fair to be, one of the most important—we should be disposed to consider it *the* most important—of the literary undertakings of the nineteenth century. We have watched its progress with the deepest interest, and before the first volume was published, the 'Quarterly Review' expressed its cordial sympathy, and its confidence in Mr. Leslie Stephen as the editor. But the gratification with which we received the first instalment of the work was not unmixed with anxiety, lest the Dictionary should meet with one of the two catastrophes to which great undertakings of this kind seem specially liable, and of which we hardly know whether the one or the other must be the most mortifying to the editor, or most irritating to the subscribers. The 'Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge' collapsed at the end of the letter A. Mazzuchelli was only able to advance his great biographical fragment on the writers of Italy—a work which, as regards fulness of knowledge, and accuracy of detail, has never been surpassed, and rarely equalled—to the end of the letter B. While, as we have before said, the second edition of the 'Biographia Britannica,' after twenty years of slow and laborious progress, came to an end in the early part of the letter F. But each of these fragments, as far as it goes, is at least of an almost uniform excellence, and favourably contrasts with other great biographical collections, which, after beginning with great promise, have met with the other and still more disastrous fate. They have in form been brought to the end of the letter Z, but the merit, the fulness, and the accuracy, have become fine by degrees and beautifully less, until the later volumes are as conspicuous by their deficiencies and omissions, as the earlier were by their merits. Rose's 'Biographical Dictionary,' of which exactly one-half is occupied by the letters A, B, and C, and Didot's 'Nouvelle Biographie Générale,' are perhaps the two most conspicuous sinners in this respect. In each case the editors, the publishers, and the contributors, seem to have become disgusted with their work, and to have been desirous only of bringing it to an end as speedily and as carelessly as possible. We think that now we need not anticipate either of these catastrophes for the new Dictionary, for although with the tenth volume the middle of C only is reached, constituting (according to Mr. Stephen's calculation, which coincides exactly with our own) about one-fifth of the entire work on the same scale, yet from the regularity with which the volumes have appeared, each at the precise
expiration

expiration of three months from its predecessor, and from the fact that so far from there appearing a falling off in the quality of the articles, the number of names inserted, or the general editing, there is to be found distinct improvement instead of deterioration as the work proceeds, it is clear that neither fate is to be expected; and we have every reason to hope and believe that those of us who live for another decade will see the completion of a 'Dictionary of National Biography' of which the country may be justly proud, which, though it may need correcting and supplementing, will probably never be superseded, and which, in unity of conception and aim, in the number of the names inserted, in fulness and accuracy of details, in the care and precision with which the authorities are cited, and in the bibliographical information given, will not only be immeasurably superior to any work of the kind which has been produced in Great Britain, but will as far surpass the German and Belgian biographical dictionaries now in progress, as these two important undertakings are in advance of the two great French collections, which until lately reigned supreme in the department of Biography.

- ART. IV.—1. *History of Antiquities of the County of Suffolk, with genealogical and architectural notices of its several towns and villages.* By the Rev. Alfred Suckling, Rector of Barsham. London, 1848.
2. *Murray's Handbook to the Eastern Counties.* London, 1875.
3. *An Historical Account of Dunwich, antiently a city, now a borough; Blithburgh, formerly a town of note, now a village; Southwold, once a village, now a town corporate, &c.* By Thomas Gardiner. London, 1754.
4. *The Suffolk Garland, or East Country Minstrel.* Ipswich, 1818.
5. *The New Suffolk Garland.* Compiled by John Glyde, jun. Ipswich, 1860.
6. *Excursions in the County of Suffolk.* London, 1818.
7. *The East Anglian, or Notes and Queries on Subjects connected with the Counties of Suffolk, Cambridge, Essex, and Norfolk.* Edited by Samuel Tymms. Lowestoft. n. d.
8. *History and Antiquities of Hengrave.* By John Gage, Esq., F.S.A. London, 1822.
9. *Diocesan Histories: Norwich.* By the Rev. Augustus Jessop, D.D.
10. *History of the Hundred of Thingoe.* By John Gage, Esq., F.S.A. London, 1838.

SUFFOLK shares the fate of many of our English counties, in having no complete county history. Suckling's painstaking work has reference to less than half the county; and the extensive and valuable collections of Mr. Davy and Mr. Jermyn remain buried in the British Museum, with apparently little prospect of being utilized for a complete history of a county which is rich in historical recollections of all kinds, from the days of St. Edmund the Martyr to those of Evelyn and of Horace Walpole. It is impossible, within the limits of an article, to do more than touch lightly upon the many events which connect Suffolk with English history, or to mention more than a few of her distinguished men, or of the ruined castles and abbeys, and quaint old manor-houses that lie buried among her green lanes and waving corn-fields.

It has been well said that there is no parish, however remote and obscure, of which the annals, if faithfully and patiently compiled, would not prove worthy of record; and the more county history is studied, the more it appears how valuable a handmaid she may become to the national historian.

Of the many autumn visitors to the county, which rejoices in the

the sobriquet of 'silly Suffolk,' few perhaps think of it save as the home of pheasants and partridges * innumerable: and it is true that its warmest admirers can claim for it nothing by way of scenery beyond the quiet home beauty which Gainsborough and Constable delighted to paint. It possesses, however, a peculiar character of its own. Cut off as East Anglia has always been, more or less, from the rest of the kingdom, its inhabitants to this day look down upon 'the shires' as a foreign and very inferior country. Many old customs still survive there, and much of the peculiar dialect which schools and School Boards are rapidly driving out, to the sorrow of philologists and antiquarians. Still, in harvest time, the labourers will come up and ask for a 'largess;'[†] a girl is still called a 'mawther,' and a snail a 'dodman.' If you ask a cottager how she is, the answer will either be that 'she fare wunnerful sadly,' or 'she fare good tidily,'—each sentence ending on a high note which makes the 'native' or home of the speaker perfectly unmistakable, even if encountered in a distant county. If you ask after her little boy, 'he is minding the dicky' (anglicè, donkey); if you talk of the crops, you are informed that 'there's a rare sight o' rōōts t' year.' The words 'cover' and 'covey' are employed by a Suffolk keeper in exactly the reverse sense of that usually ascribed to them, while still stranger perversions of language occur in the use of the words 'lobster' for 'stoat,' and 'screech owl' for 'stone plover.' The people are generally a clean, honest, and industrious race, famous for making good servants, and chiefly employed in agriculture and fishing; there being, with the exception of Messrs. Garrett and Ransome's great agricultural implement manufactories at Leiston and Ipswich, but few manufactories of any kind.[‡]

The

* It is to be hoped that the worship of St. Partridge is no longer carried to the extent indicated by the following announcement, said to have been actually made by the parish clerk in a Suffolk church some sixty years ago: 'There'll be no service in this here charch for three Sundays; 'cos as how, there be a hen partridge a-setting in the charch-yard; and Muster—(naming the clergyman), he as—she maunna be distarbed.'

[†] They no longer however 'hollao largess,' as in Bloomfield's time, and the 'harkey,' or harvest home, has fallen into desuetude in its old form. When kept with due solemnity, a pair of ram's horns, painted and decorated with flowers, was carried round the board, and the head labourer crowned with it. Hunting the squirrel on Christmas Day was also an old custom within the memory of persons still living.

[‡] There was for a short time a manufactory of china at Lowestoft, founded in 1756 by Mr. Hewlin Leeson, at Gunton Hall. All descriptions of ware appear to have been made there, from ordinary earthenware to the finest porcelain. The rose was a favourite subject on the pieces, both as the arms of the town and also as the signature of the Frenchman Rose, who was employed in their decoration. The great characteristic of the later and more advanced porcelain made at

The present state of agriculture is thus described in the Report furnished to Her Majesty's Commissioners by Mr. Druce:—

'Suffolk is classified as a corn county, that is, a county in which the acreage under corn is two-thirds more than the acreage under permanent pasture. Its agriculture consists almosts entirely of corn growing, sheep breeding and feeding, and winter grazing or feeding of cattle. The soil varies from light gravel or sand on the east coast, to stiff clay in the centre of the county, "High Suffolk,"* as it is called (where no one will own to living), and some chalk on the western border. The four-course system of farming is almost universally adopted, coupled with restrictions against the sale of hay, straw, and roots off the farm. Rents, in 1880, ranged from 7s. 6d. an acre for very light sandy soil, to 40s. an acre for good mixed soil farms, and 42s. for best marsh grazing land.† The cottages, as elsewhere, are fairly good on the large estates, very bad in the "open" villages, where they are in the hands of small proprietors.'

Villages are, however, the exception rather than the rule in Suffolk, the cottages being generally scattered about the parish.

These rents present a singular contrast to those mentioned by Arthur Young‡ in 1771, when he talks of average rents of 12s. to 14s. per acre; and the wages of agricultural labourers have risen from 12s. per week in harvest, and 7s. § in winter, to 12s. or 13s. per week ordinary wages, 13s. to 15s. for 'horse drivers,' as the carters are called, and 7l. to 9l. for the harvest month. There is a peculiar breed of Suffolk cows without horns, and Suffolk Punches are still famous, as they were in Young's day, when he was so greatly impressed with their strength and hardiness, adding: 'They are all taught to draw in concert, and many farmers are so attentive to this point,

Lowestoft is its extreme minuteness, intricacy of pattern, and beauty of finish. Indeed, much of the decoration is far superior, both in design and in the exquisite, and almost microscopical nicety of the pencilling and finish, to those mostly produced at other English manufactories.'—Marryat's 'History of Pottery and Porcelain.' Several beautiful pieces of this porcelain were in the possession of the venerable Lady Smith, widow of the botanist, who died at Lowestoft a few years ago at the age of 104.

* The mystery as to the origin of the term 'High Suffolk,' which has long been a puzzle to antiquarians, would appear to have been solved by the recent investigations into the Archives of the Corporation of Eye, conducted by the Historical MSS. Commissioners. It is clearly proved that from King John's time to the present century the borough has been styled Heye, *alias* Eye, and that the boundaries of High Suffolk were in former times identical with the boundaries of the Royal Honour of Heye. It is, however, to be observed that in the present day Eye is pronounced like 'bay.'

† There has been a very heavy fall in rents since this was written.

‡ Arthur Young was born at Bradfield Hall, and is buried in the churchyard there.

§ They were still about 7s. as late as 1850.

that

that they have teams, every horse of which will fall on his knees at the word of command twenty times, in the full drawing attitude, and all at the same moment, but without exerting any strength, till a variation in the word orders them to give all their strength, and then they will carry out amazing weights.' Indeed, these horses, together with the cultivation of carrots, and the custom of manuring with what he calls 'crag,' or crumbled shells, appear to be the three points which that shrewd and accurate observer thought most worth noting in his observations on the husbandry of his native county.*

This 'crag' is to the geologist the most interesting deposit in Suffolk and the adjoining county of Norfolk. 'These beds afford,' says Sir Charles Lyell, 'the least interrupted series of consecutive documents to which we can refer in the British Islands, when we desire to connect the Tertiary with the post-Tertiary period. The fossil shells of the deposit in question clearly point to a gradual refrigeration of climate, from a temperature somewhat warmer than that now prevailing in our latitudes to one of intense cold.' Besides the beds of crag, the central and north-west portions of Suffolk are districts of chalk and chalk marl, forming part of the great chalk band which crosses England from the coast of Dorsetshire to that of Norfolk.'

A large portion of the population of the east coast of Suffolk earn their livelihood, either wholly or in part, by fishing. The two great ports of Yarmouth and Lowestoft furnish a very large number of the trawlers engaged in the

* Old Tusser, author of the 'Five Hundred Points of Husbandry' (1557), who, though not a native of Suffolk, lived for some time at Ipswich, writes thus of Suffolk in his 'Comparison between Champion Country and Severale':—

'All these doth enclosure bring,
Experience teacheth no less;
I speak not to boast of a thing,
But only a truth to express.
Example, if doubt ye do make,
By Suffolk and Essex go take.
More plenty of mutton and beef,
Corn, butter and cheese of the best,
More wealth anywhere; to be brief,
More people, more handsome and prest
Where find ye? (go search any const)
Than there, where enclosure is most.
More work for the labouring man,
As well in the town as the field,
Or thereof (devise if ye can)
More profit, what countries do yield.
More seldom, where see ye the poor
Go begging from door unto door.'

North

North Sea fisheries; and the loss of life among the fishermen belonging to the district extending from Cromer to Deal is greater than that on any other part of our coasts. The ratio of loss per 1000 men for this district is 11·31 per annum, while for the Newhaven district it is only 0·75, and for the United Kingdom, 3·9. H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh, in his very interesting paper on the 'Sea Fisheries and Fishing Population,' attributes this in great measure to the system of 'ferrying,' as it is called. By this is meant the custom of small steamers, or smacks, attending on the fleet of trawlers for the purpose of conveying their fish to land, without their incurring the delay and loss of time involved in taking each catch ashore themselves. In the excitement of getting alongside the carrier, and tossing the boxes of fish on board, a work which is carried on regardless of the state of the weather, many lives are lost; and, as no enquiry into the circumstances is ever made, there would seem to be no check on the recklessness of the men. 'Coopering,' as the practice of having smacks fitted out for the sale of spirits and tobacco is called, is another constant source of mischief and danger; and one which it is very difficult to control, many vessels under foreign flags being engaged in it. Trawling and great-line fishing, which seem to be specially practised on the East Coast, are also dangerous, as they are carried on at a considerable distance from land; and the small boats are liable to be caught in the fogs so prevalent in the North Sea.

Much employment is also afforded by the shooting and game-preserving for which Suffolk is so noted; a very large number of men being employed as keepers, watchers, beaters, &c. At the close of a day's sport there is often quite a little army assembled, and it requires no mean skill to organize a successful day's partridge-driving. Enormous bags are sometimes made; in nine days the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh once shot at Elveden 2530 partridges to his own gun, the largest bag being 780 birds on September 8th, 1876. At Benacre—Sir Thomas Gooch's—in 1806, on the farmers complaining that the hares were too numerous, no less than 6012 were destroyed between February 1st and March 12th.* Ground game, even before the passing of the Ground Game Act, had greatly diminished in numbers. A great deal of nonsense has been written on the subject of shooting by writers who know nothing whatever of their subject, and who talk of it as if it were a mere day's killing in a poultry yard; but the fact is, that the driven partridge and

* Badminton Library, 'Shooting.'

the rocketing pheasant are beyond the skill of many a man who considers himself a very fair shot. Very good sport is also to be had on some of the broads, which, though less numerous than in Norfolk, yet occur here and there, near the coast; and, in hard winters, are the resort of many rare kinds of wild-fowl.*

But enough of Suffolk as she is; let us see what the records of history have to tell of her in bygone days.

It has been justly remarked, that 'the insular character of East Anglia has influenced its history to a very great degree.' The Iceni, the earliest inhabitants of whom we have any record, were defended on three sides by the sea and its estuaries; while, to the west, the huge fen district, which stretched from the Wash more than sixty miles to the southward, and the great boundary dyke, called the 'Devil's Dyke,' formed a formidable barrier against any incursion. This dyke abuts on the fens about five miles from Newmarket, runs through part of Suffolk and the whole of Essex, and ends not far from Tilbury Fort.†

There is a smaller dyke, a few miles to the westward, called the Fleam, or Balsham Dyke, in opening part of which, some years ago, a gigantic skeleton was found, with crossed swords placed on its breast. It is needless here to relate the famous rising of the Iceni, when, joined by the Trinobantes of Essex, they plundered and burned Camulodunum (Colchester), and totally defeated the ninth legion under Cerealis; or the defeat of the Britons, under Boadicea, who put an end to her life by poison. The name of the Iceni still survives in the Icknield Way, the old British trackway which ran, and may still in great measure be traced, from the coast of Norfolk to the western parts of the island; and possibly such names as Ickworth, Icleford, Icklingham, &c., may be ascribed to the same source. When the Saxons first settled in this part of Britain is uncertain; it would appear, however, that they very soon divided the province into the two districts which have ever since been known as Norfolk and Suffolk—'Northfolk and Southfolk.' The conversion of the people to Christianity was due, in the first instance, to Sigebert, King of East Anglia, who, having been exiled in Gaul, was there converted to the Christian faith. He was assisted in his labours by Felix, a Burgundian, who became first Bishop of Dunwich:—

* It would appear that, even from a farmer's point of view, pheasants are by no means an unmixed evil, since Mr. Tegetmeier reports finding in the crop of one bird 720 wire-worms, and in that of another 440 grubs of the crane-fly.

† It is said that Mr. Elwes, the famous miser, used to ride up and down it on dark nights to avoid paying the turnpikes.

'At Dunmök than was Felix fyrst Byshop
Of Est Angle, and taught the Chrysten fayth
That is full hye in heuen I hope.'

Felix is said to have founded a high school for learning at Dunwich, 'an institution which may perhaps be regarded as the first germ of our great existing universities.' Sigebert lived for some time at Dunwich, where he had a palace, but he finally retired into a monastery which he had built at Beodricsweorth, the later St. Edmunds Bury. But even the 'cloister'd cell' did not, in those troublous times, afford security, for when Penda, the great King of Mercia, invaded the kingdom of East Anglia, and had reduced the East Anglian army to great straits, the soldiers insisted upon their King coming forth to lead them, or, as Stowe puts it, 'they pluckt him out of the monastery.' But he utterly refused to fight; and, standing at the head of his troops, armed only with a white staff, was speedily cut down.

Bury St. Edmunds recalls the tragic fate of Edmund, a Saxon prince distinguished for his virtue and piety. In 870 he was defeated by Ingwar, a Danish chieftain, and fled to Hoxne, where he hid himself under a bridge over the Dove, called to this day 'Gold Bridge.' 'A newly-married couple crossing the bridge by moonlight, saw the reflection of the King's golden spurs in the water,' and betrayed him. Accordingly St. Edmund pronounced a curse on every couple who should cross this bridge on their way to be married, and until the bridge was rebuilt in the present century a wide circuit was taken by bride and bridegroom to avoid it. It is thought that the King's bright armour is still to be seen on certain nights glimmering through the waters of the brook. The Danes having taken Edmund prisoner, bound him to a tree and made him a mark for their arrows, till, says Lydgate, 'his body was like a porcupine.' According to tradition the tree still existed in Oakley Park (Sir Edward Kerrison's) till 1849, when it fell, and, curiously enough, an arrow-head was found in the heart of it. The legend relates that the King's head was stricken off, and flung into a wood, where it was found, some time afterwards, carefully guarded between the paws of a wolf, who gave up his treasure, and then retired 'with doleful mourning.' 'The severed head of St. Edmund, the head guarded by a wolf, and the crown with two arrows in saltire, which are so frequently found in stained glass or on sculptured stone not only at Bury but throughout Norfolk and Suffolk, all refer to the martyrdom and its legend.' (Murray.)

The shrine of St. Edmund became the chief religious centre
of

of Eastern England, and many were the Kings and nobles who visited it and presented rich offerings. But the most important event in its history was the great meeting of all the barons in 1214, when on St. Edmund's Day, November 20, Archbishop Langton, standing before the high altar in the Abbey Church, received the pledges of the barons to maintain their confederacy till they should obtain a charter from the King. Magna Charta was signed on June 15, in the following year. Only a few fragments of St. Edmunds Abbey Church remain, but an inscription marks the spot where this memorable scene, second only in importance to the signing of Magna Charta itself, took place. At Bury, in 1446, the good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester was murdered; strangled in his bed, it was said, by order of Queen Margaret and Suffolk. It will be remembered that the scene of nearly the whole of Act iii. of Shakspeare's 'King Henry VI.,' Part II., is laid at Bury. Gloucester's ghost is said to haunt the ruins of the Abbey to this day, though his tomb is at St. Albans. Mary Tudor, sister of Henry VIII. and wife first of Louis XII. of France and then of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, is buried in St. Mary's Church at Bury; and the Queen has recently erected a handsome stained window to her memory. Jocelyn of Brakeland, the famous chronicler who recorded the events in the Abbey history between 1173 and 1202, gives perhaps the most vivid picture extant of the interior life of a great monastic institution; and Carlyle, in his 'Past and Present,' comments on it in his quaint and vivid style.

Another remarkable monk of Bury was John Lydgate, a contemporary of Chaucer, and supposed by some to be the author of two or three of the poems, such as the 'Complaint of the Black Knight' and 'the Flower and the Leaf,' generally ascribed to the father of English poetry. He took his name from the village of Lydgate, 'a small village,' says Camden, 'but not to be omitted because it gave birth to John Lidgate, the monk whose wit seems to have been formed and modelled by the very Muses; all the beauties and elegancies are so lively express'd in his English Poetry.' A modern opinion, that of the Rev. Stopford Brooke, is less flattering to his poetry; he calls him a 'long-winded and third-rate poet, but a delightful man; fresh, natural, and happy even to his old age, when he recalls himself as a boy, "weeping for nought, and anon after glad." There was scarcely any literary work he could not do. He rimed history, ballads, and legends, till the monastery was delighted. He made pageants for Henry VI., masques and May games for aldermen, mummeries for the Lord Mayor, and

satirical

satirical ballads on the follies of the day.' His chief works were the 'Tales of Princes,' the 'Story of Thebes,' and the 'Troye Book;,' of which, however, the first is a translation from Boccaccio.

Suffolk 'hath,' says Fuller, 'no Cathedral therein, and the parochial churches (generally fair), no one of transcendent eminency. But formerly it had so magnificent an Abbey Church in Bury, the sun shineth not on a fairer, with three lesser churches waiting thereon, in the same Churchyard.' A fine gateway still remains, built of the flint work so largely employed in the construction of Suffolk churches. This flint work, mostly a combination of flint and stone, is technically called 'flush work.' It is the local substitute for freestone, in which Suffolk is remarkably deficient. The work is generally handsome in effect; often, especially on the porches, delicate and beautiful; and occasionally it is wrought into long inscriptions. No account of Suffolk churches, however brief, can omit to mention the round church towers on which so much antiquarian lore has been expended. At one time it was thought that they were of Danish origin, but as Mr. Gage, in his 'History of the Hundred of Thingoe,' remarks with much truth, if this were so, they ought to be found in Denmark, and also in Northumbria, where the Danish dynasty held full sway; whereas they are almost entirely confined to the limits of East Anglia; there being 125 in Norfolk, 40 in Suffolk; and in the rest of England only 2 in Berkshire, 2 in Sussex, 1 in Surrey, 2 in Cambridgeshire,* 1 in Northamptonshire, and 7 in Essex. Mr. Parker's theory is probably the correct one, *i.e.* that 'built of flint (as they are without exception) they are built round to suit the material, and to save the expense of the stone quoins, which are necessary for square corners, and which may often not have been easy to procure in districts where the building stone has all to be imported.' Some of these towers are quite plain, others, like those at Herringfleet and Little Saxham, have rich Norman work in their upper stories.†

Suffolk is also, like the other Eastern Counties, rich in brasses; indeed most of the brasses in England are to be found

* One of these, at Bartlow, was long supposed to have been built by Canute, which probably gave rise to the theory of their Danish origin.

† A countryman hearing two archæologists wondering over the origin of a round tower, explained it thus: 'Before the Flood it was used as a well, and when the inhabitants of the new generation who resided on that spot were looking for a place to build a church, they selected this site because the old well would do for a steeple, and therefore they built the church to it as it now stands'—East Anglian.

in Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, and Kent. It is supposed that the wealthy clothiers, who built and beautified so many of the churches, placed in them a large number of these memorials. Will. Dowsing, the iconoclast of East Anglia, has much to answer for in the destruction of Suffolk churches: he was appointed Parliamentary Visitor, under a warrant from the Earl of Manchester, for demolishing the superstitious pictures and ornaments of churches, &c., within the county of Suffolk, in the years 1643-44. His journal has been published, and contains an account of the destruction he wrought. Thus at Walberswick—to give but one specimen—he writes, ‘Brake down 40 superstitious pictures, and to take 5 Crosses off the Steeple and Porch, and we had 8 superstitious inscriptions on the grave stones.’ He also boasts of having destroyed 192 brasses in 52 churches in Suffolk, 30 of them in one church, All-Hallows, Sudbury.

The inhabitants of Suffolk seem to have been of a turbulent and independent disposition, frequent risings having taken place there throughout the Middle Ages; while repeated threats of invasion kept them in a state of watchfulness and anxiety, of which we in these more peaceful times can have little conception. After the death of Edmund, Guthrum, the Danish King, was baptized by the name of Athelstan, and the peace of Wedmore, between him and Alfred, gave him a kingdom which included ‘all Northumbria, all East Anglia, all Central England, east of a line which stretches from the Thames’ mouth along the sea to Bedford, thence along the Ouse to Watling Street, and by Watling Street to Chester;’ and this vast extent of territory, known as the Danelagh, remained subject to the Northmen till it was reconquered by Edward in 920. But a later Danish invasion began about 991; when Ulfscytel, though himself of Danish origin, gallantly defended East Anglia against Sweyne, who, however, eventually conquered the whole country; Ulfscytel being defeated near Ipswich in 1010. Finally, the East-Anglian Earldom, from which Essex was now detached, was bestowed by Edward the Confessor on Gurth, the brother of Harold, who, like him, fell at the battle of Hastings. William the Conqueror gave large grants to barons in Norfolk and Suffolk; but as early as 1076, Ralph of Wader, his Earl of those counties, organized a rising against him, and during the subsequent struggles between the King and the Barons, Suffolk had her full share in the troubles. First, Ipswich was besieged and taken by Stephen in 1153, during his contest with the Empress Maud; then in 1173 Hugh Bigod, supporting the sons of Henry II. in their rising against their father, brought over a large

a large body of Flemings, under the Earl of Leicester, who, landing at Walton, near Felixstowe, marched to Framlingham, besieged and took Haughley Castle, held for the King by Ranulph de Broc, and were finally overthrown at Fornham St. Geneviève, not far from Bury, where Richard de Lucy and Humphrey de Bohun drove them all into the river Lark. Local tradition points out some large tumuli, as marking the tombs of the Fleming leaders; and a ring, supposed to have belonged to the Countess of Leicester ('the Amazonian proud Countess,' as Weever calls her), was found in cleaning out the river not many years ago. Soon afterwards Henry marched against Hugh Bigod, and in spite of his defiant song, according to the old ballad,—

‘Were I in my castle of Bungay,
Upon the river of Waveney,
I’d no care for the King of Cockney,’

forced him to submit, and dismantled both his castles, Framlingham and Bungay.

More terrible than any invasion was the Black Death, the ravages of which in the Eastern Counties seem to have been greater than in any other part of the kingdom. Dr. Jessop has devoted much attention to the subject, and in his admirable ‘*Diocesan History of Norwich*,’ tells us that—

‘during the five years comprehended between March 25, 1344, and the same day of 1349, the annual average of institutions to benefices of all kinds amounted to exactly 81, while during the next year, ending March 25, 1350, no less than 831 persons received institution within the diocese. Bearing in mind that the episcopal records take no account of deaths in the monasteries, except where the head of the house was carried off; that none of the unbeneficed clergy are noticed, except where they were presented with preferment; that the mendicant orders, who were labouring among the townspeople, and were hardly under episcopal jurisdiction, never came before the Bishop at all; it is impossible to estimate the number of clergy in the diocese of Norwich whom the Black Death carried off at less than 2000. The effect of so huge a calamity it is almost impossible for us now to conceive; the smaller benefices could not be filled up, many must have remained for years without incumbents.’—‘*Diocesan History of Norwich*,’ p. 121.

In the reign of Richard II., when an invasion was hourly expected from France, great preparations were made to resist it. Froissart gives a graphic description of the proceedings on both sides of the Channel. 1287 ships were assembled in the opposite harbours of Sluys and Blankenburgh. ‘Money was no more spared than if it rained gold, or was pumped up from the

the sea.' 'The Earls of Stafford and Pembroke were sent to Orwell with 500 men-at-arms, and 1200 archers; Sir Henry and Sir Faulx Percy to Yarmouth with 300 men-at-arms and 600 archers.' Watchmen were posted on all the hills near the sea-coasts opposite to France and Flanders. 'The manner of posting these watchers was as follows: they had large Gascony casks filled with sand, which they placed one on the other, rising like columns; on these were planks, where the watchmen remained day and night on the look-out. They were ordered the moment they should observe the fleet of France steering towards land, to light torches, and make great fires on the hills to alarm the country, and the forces within sight of these fires were to hasten thither.' However, from contrary winds and various causes the invasion came to nothing.

A more peaceful incursion was that of the Flemings, who settled in Norfolk and Suffolk as clothiers and woollen manufacturers. Philippa of Hainault, wife of Edward III., had a great share in this beneficent enterprise. 'Blessed be the memory of King Edward III. and Philippa of Hainault his queen, who first invented clothes,' says a monastic chronicler, by which startling statement, however, he only means to imply that, by their advice, the English first manufactured *cloth*.* Kersey and Lindsey-woolsey are said to be named from the villages of Kersey and Lindsey, near Hadleigh, which was a great centre of the trade. The importance of the trade may be gathered from the frequent petitions to the House of Lords from the clothiers of Suffolk and Essex, drafts of Acts relating to their trade, &c., to be found among the records of the House of Lords.†

Nowhere in England did Wat Tyler's rebellion in 1381 spread more wildly than in the Eastern Counties, under the leadership of Jack Straw:—

'Prior John of Cambridge, who in the vacancy of the Abbot was in charge of the great monastic house at Bury St. Edmunds, was surrounded in his own house at Mildenhall, betrayed by his own servants, judged in rude mockery of the law by villein and bondsmen, condemned and killed. The corpse lay naked in the open field for five days, no man daring to bury it.'

One of the most striking events in the history of Suffolk is the raising of the standard of Queen Mary at Framlingham Castle, July 11th, 1553. She had narrowly escaped being thrown into the Tower, a trap being laid for her by the Duke

* Strickland's 'Queens of England,' vol. i. p. 551.

† Hist. MSS., Report iv., Rep. vii., p. 165 a, &c.

of Northumberland, who was anxious to possess himself of her person, and thus secure the throne to his own daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Grey. Mary, however, on her journey from Hunsdon to London received a warning from some friend, who told her of her brother's death, and she at once turned her steps to Sawston Hall,* in Cambridgeshire, where she slept, and thence, having had a narrow escape of being taken prisoner by a party from Cambridge, who had risen against her, to Framlingham. There she raised her standard, and there her Suffolk partizans mustered around her. Framlingham, which had passed from the Bigods, Earls of Suffolk, through Thomas of Brotherton, son of Edward I., and others, to the Mowbrays, was then in possession of the Howards, Dukes of Norfolk, whose magnificent tombs still adorn the church. The second Duke of that House was the victor of Flodden; the third Duke was still in the Tower, where, though nearly eighty years old, he had been imprisoned for seven years; while his son, the gallant and accomplished Surrey, had been executed on a charge of high treason; the chief accusation against him being that he had presumed to quarter the Royal arms. Surrey's son, Lord Thomas Howard, was among Mary's adherents on this occasion. Twenty years later, he shared his father's fate, being beheaded in the Tower for conspiring with Mary Queen of Scots; and his son, again, who never became Duke of Norfolk, but succeeded to the Earldom of Arundel in right of his mother, died a prisoner in the Tower in 1595. 'Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown,' might in those days have been applied to the wearers of coronets as well, for it is the exception, rather than the rule, to find it recorded of any great noble that he died in his bed.

The Duke of Norfolk being still in prison, Framlingham castle remained in the hands of the governor appointed by Henry VIII., Thomas Shennings, who adhering to the ancient ritual, was willing to surrender it to Mary as Queen. She remained there till July 31, and to this day a lane near the castle goes by the name of Bloody Queen Mary's Lane. Sir Henry Jermingham at Yarmouth succeeded in obtaining possession of six ships of war, which had been sent with cannon and other munitions of war for the siege of Framlingham; and Sir Edward Hastings came over to Mary's cause with a large body of militia that he had been commissioned by the Privy Council to raise for Queen Jane.

* Sawston was burnt by her pursuers; but she promised her faithful adherent, Mr. Huddleston, that she would build him a new house, and kept her word.

The tide quickly turned; one after another the great nobles and others hastened to Framlingham, among them Bishop Ridley; 'but' says Fox, 'he was evilly received, and sent back on a halting horse.' On the 31st of July Mary set out on her progress to London, sleeping at Ipswich, where Cecil came to meet her, and at Ingatestone, where her sister Elizabeth, with other ladies and the Privy Council joined her train. She took up her abode in the Tower, where, kneeling on the Green before St. Peter's Church, she found the State prisoners, and released them all; among them the aged Duke of Norfolk, from whose castle she had just come, and Stephen Gardiner, also a native of Suffolk, whom she at once made her Lord Chancellor. She seems to have had a warm regard for the Duke, for when he died the next year, she suspended the festivities on account of her marriage, 'because,' says Heylyn, 'she loved him entirely.'

A quaint account of his funeral is given in the 'Diary of Henry Maclyn, citizen of London':—

'The ij day of October, 1554, was bered the Nobull duke of Norfolk at a plasse called Fremynghame Chyrche, and there was a goodly herse of wax as I have sene in thes days, with a dozen of banner rolles of ys progene (*i.e.* ancestral descent) and xii dosen of pen-selles, xii dosen Scotchions, and with Standards and lii cotes of arms, and a banar of damaske, and iii banars of ymages, and mony mornars, and a gret dolle (dole) and after gret dener (for the furnishing of which dener were killed forty great oxen, and a hundred sheep, and sixty calves, besides venison, swans, and cranes, capon, rabbits, pigeons, pikes and other provisions both flesh and fish). There were also great plenty of wine, and of bread and beer, as great plenty as had ever been known, both for ryche and pore; all the country came thither and a grete dolle of money ther wher bestowed upon the poorer sort.'

Norfolk and Suffolk had from the first espoused the cause of the Reformation with great vehemence, and consequently did not escape the persecution which followed upon Mary's accession. Above twenty persons were burnt within the county—of whom the most remarkable was Dr. Rowland Taylor—long 'parson' of Hadleigh, of whose martyrdom Fox gives a touching and circumstantial account. Fuller quaintly describes him as 'pleasant Taylor,' adding, 'he was a great scholar, painful preacher, charitable to the poor, of a comely countenance, proper person (but inclining to corpulency), and cheerful behaviour.'

A singular circumstance connected with Suffolk is recorded in Queen Mary's reign, *i.e.* that she appointed Lady Rous a justice

justice of the peace for Suffolk, 'who did usually sit on the bench at azzises and sessions among the other justices, "cincta gladio," girt with the sword.'

Various stories are told of Queen Elizabeth's progresses in Suffolk. Her lute is still preserved at Helmingham, the quaint old manor-house of the Tollemaches: at Hawstead she dropped her silver-mounted fan into the moat, and knighted the Lord of Hawstead, Drury by name, for returning it to her. From these Drurys, Drury Lane in London derived its name (Murray). But her visit to Euston had much more serious consequences for the unfortunate young Rookwood, to whom it then belonged. He was brought into her presence, and 'she gave him ordinary thanks for his bad house, and her fair hand to kiss,' after which it was 'braved' at (whatever that may mean). The Lord Chamberlain then understanding that he was excommunicated for papistry, severely reprimanded him for presuming to attempt the Royal presence, after which his whole house was ransacked, under pretence of searching for a missing piece of plate, and

'in the hay-house was found such an image of Our Lady (says Topcliffe) for greatness, for gayness, and workmanship, I never did see a match; and after a sort of country dance, ended in Her Majesty's sight, the idol was set in sight of the people, who *avoided* (*i.e.* turned from it). Her Majesty commanded it to the fire, which, in her sight, by the country people was quickly done; to her content and the unspeakable joy of every one but some one or two who had sucked the idol's poisoned milk. Within a fortnight, Elizabeth's unfortunate young host was committed to prison at Norwich for obstinate papistry.*

The subsequent history of Euston is of a less tragic nature. It came into the hands of the Dukes of Grafton by the marriage of the first Duke (son of Charles II.) with Isabella, daughter and heiress of Sir Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, one of the A's of the Cabal. The house was built by Lord Arlington, and here Evelyn paid him frequent visits, and gives in his 'Memoirs' elaborate accounts of all the improvements, both in building and planting, made at his suggestion. To use his own expression, 'Lord Arlington himself is given to no expensive vice save building, and to have all things rich, polite, and friendly . . . he and his lady love fine things, and to live easily, pompously, and hospitably, but with so vast an expense as to plunge my Lord into debt exceedingly'—a natural result, specially when we read of his entertaining Charles II. there

* Strickland's 'Queens of England,' vol. iv. p. 435.

(in 1671), 'the whole house filled from one end to the other with lords, ladies, and gallants; there was such a furnished table as I had seldom seene, nor anything more splendid and free; so that for fifteen days there were entertained at least 200 people, and halfe as many horses, besides servants and guards, at infinite expense.' Mademoiselle de la Querouaille, afterwards Duchess of Portsmouth, was of the party; but Evelyn speaks contemptuously enough of 'that famous beauty, but in my opinion of a childish, simple, baby face.' Lord Arlington's pictures, of which there is one at Euston, may always be known by a broad black patch across the nose; the result of a wound received during the Civil War. Horace Walpole writes thus in 1743: 'Euston is one of the most admired seats in England,—in my opinion because Kent has a most absolute disposition of it. Kent is now so fashionable, that, like Addison's "Liberty," he can "make bleak rocks and barren mountains smile." I believe the Duke wishes he could make them green too. The house is large and bad: it was built by Lord Arlington, and stands as all old houses do, for convenience of water and shelter, in a hole; so it neither sees nor is seen: he has no money to build another. The park is fine, the old woods excessively so; they are much grander than Mr. Kent's passion, clumps,—that is sticking a dozen trees here and there till a lawn looks like the ten of spades.* All this country has been sung by Robert Bloomfield, author of the 'Farmer's Boy,' and of that charming ballad the 'Fakenham Ghost.' He was born at the neighbouring village of Honnington. The following lines are worth quoting:—

'Where noble Grafton spreads his rich domains
Round Euston's pastures, vale and sloping plains,
Where woods and groves in solemn grandeur rise,
Where the kite brooding, unmolested flies;
The woodcock, and the painted pheasant race,
And skulking foxes destined for the chase.'

In former days the Dukes of Grafton used to move their pack of hounds from Euston to Wakefield, their Lodge in Whittlebury Forest, hunting as they went.

Another place visited by Queen Elizabeth was Hengrave, then the seat of Sir Thomas Kytson, son of another Sir Thomas, who, having made a large fortune by trade in London, built in 1525 the picturesque mansion which still remains. His granddaughter, Mary Kytson, married Earl Rivers, and their third daughter, Lady Penelope Darcy, inherited her mother's Suffolk

* Walpole's 'Letters,' ed. Cunningham, vol. i. p. 252.

property. It is said that Sir George Trenchard, Sir John Gage, and Sir William Hervey, each solicited her in marriage at the same time, and that, to keep the peace between the rivals, she threatened the first aggressor with her perpetual displeasure; humorously telling them that if they would wait, she would have them all in their turns, a promise which the lady actually performed. She married, first in 1610, Sir George Trenchard, of Wolverton, in Dorsetshire; secondly, in 1612, Sir John Gage, of Firle,* in Sussex; and thirdly, in 1642, Sir William Hervey of Ickworth (Gage's 'Hengrave'). There is a picture of her at Firle, which, though that of a handsome woman, does not give the idea of very striking beauty.† Sir William on his marriage removed to Hengrave, with his children by a former wife, and so many branches of the houses of Gage and Hervey were living there together, that it is said the establishment at this period consisted of above 100 persons, in alliance with each other.

A curious relic of Queen Elizabeth's sporting proclivities remained till the beginning of the present century, in the shape of a hunting lodge, at Huntingfield, built round six straight massy oaks, which supported the roof of the great hall as they grew. Here she was entertained by Lord Hunsdon, and shot a buck with her own hand from a tree which was long afterwards known as the Queen's oak.

During one of her Suffolk progresses, Queen Elizabeth, being at Ipswich, 'took a great dislike at the imprudent behaviour of many of the ministers and readers . . . and more particularly was she offended with the clergy's marriage, and that in cathedrals and colleges there were so many wives and widows and children seen, which, she said, was so contrary to the interest of the founders, and so much tending to the interruption of the studies of those who were placed there. Therefore she issued out an order to all dignitaries, dated August 9, at Ipswich, to forbid all resort of women to the lodgings of cathedrals or colleges, and that upon pain of losing their ecclesiastical promotions.'‡

Among the country gentlemen who attended the Queen on one of these occasions was Sir Arthur Higham, of the family of which Montaigne thus speaks, in his '*Essai sur la Gloire*':—

* The third son of this marriage, Sir Edward Gage, was the ancestor of the late owner of Hengrave.

† It is a singular coincidence that the present Viscount Gage is descended from two of the three husbands, Sir John Gage and Sir William Hervey.

‡ Strype's '*Life of Parker*.'

'Je n'ay point de nom qui soit assez mien : de deux que j'ay, l'un est commun à toute ma race, voire encores à d'aultres; il y a une famille à Paris et à Montpellier qui se surnomme Montaigne, une aultre en Bretagne et à Xaintonge; de la Montaigne; le remuement d'une seule syllabe meslera nos fusées de façon que j'auray part à leur gloire, et eulx à l'adventure à ma honte; et si les miens se sont aultrefois surnommés Eyquem, surnom qui touche encore une maison cogneue en Angleterre: quant à mon aultre nom, il est à quiconque aura envie de la prendre.'

All through Queen Elizabeth's reign East Anglia was in a most disturbed and miserable state with regard to religion. 'The penal laws passed against the Recusants, forced the conscientious Romanists to declare themselves; and from this time till the close of the century there was neither peace nor security for life or substance for those who showed any reluctance to conform.' Then came all the troubles of the seventeenth century, when both sides alike persecuted each other. Archbishop Laud tried his best to silence the lecturers, and Dr. Matthew Wren (Bishop of Norwich from 1635 to 1638) carried out the same policy, with the result, that hundreds of the clergy emigrated to Holland and to America. Then the tide turned; the Long Parliament passed the ordinance of sequestration, and the clergy who still persisted in the use of the Liturgy of the Church of England were persecuted with a rancorous cruelty which seems almost incredible. Edward Barton, rector of Grundsburgh, was sequestered 'for non-residence, for having an infirm body and a low voice, for reading his sermons—and that imperfectly—and, what's worse, they lasted but half an hour; and also for neglecting his cure one Sundaye; and this is the whole of his accusations.'* The vicar of Stradbroke, James Buck, was not only turned out of his living, but imprisoned in Ipswich jail, and reduced for two months to the prison allowance of bread and water, 'the consequence of which,' says Walker, 'was very remarkable; for whereas before he was forty years old he was so extremely afflicted with the gout, that the physicians did not believe he could live two years longer, his constitution was by this change of diet and abstemiousness so altered, that he never had the gout after, but enjoyed great degrees of health, notwithstanding his being a very hard student till after eighty years of age.' Lionel Playters, rector of Uggheshall, who, afterwards, on the death of his elder brother, Sir William Playters, succeeded to the baronetcy and family estates at Sotterley, was also turned out with his wife and children at an

* Walker, 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 208.

hour's notice. Walker adds: 'I have also been informed that one chief article against him (which was much insisted upon before those sequestrators that it was looked upon as a prime cause of his ejection) was his eating of custard after a scandalous manner, of which, it seems, he was a very great lover.' However, Walker himself does not seem quite to believe this story. Lionel Playters never ceased to exercise his ministry, but continued to preach regularly to the end of his life. The rector of St. Margaret's, Ipswich, 'being,' says Walker, 'a long time imprisoned for his loyalty, and during that time, having little else to do, counted, as 'tis said, the words of the Solemn League and Covenant, and found them exactly 666, the number of the beast;' but the voracious Walker is compelled to add, in a note: 'how he counted them, I know not; all the words exceed twice that number.'

Norfolk and Suffolk were, throughout the Civil War, so strongly on the side of the Parliament, that comparatively little fighting took place in this part of England.*

Lincoln, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, and Huntingdonshire were called the seven Associated Counties, with the Earl of Manchester as Commander. This was the only one of several similar Associations, which lasted throughout the war, and kept its own borders clear of invasion.† Cromwell himself took a very active part in its proceedings, and was colonel of a regiment of horse raised within the Associated Counties. We find him on March 10th, 1642, writing to 'his honoured friends,' the Deputy-Lieutenants of Suffolk, for money.

'A few days later, having heard that the town of Lowestoft (Laystoft it was called in those days) "had received in divers strangers and was fortifying itself," he marched towards that town, where he was to meet with the Yarmouth volunteers, who brought five or six pieces of ordnance. The town had blocked themselves up; all except where they had placed their ordnance, which were three pieces; before which a chain was placed to keep off the horse. The Colonel summoned the town, and demanded, If they would deliver up their strangers, the town, and their army? promising them their favour, if so; if not, none. They yielded to deliver up their strangers, but not to the rest. Whereupon our Norwich dragoons crept under the

* There was, however, a rising at Bury in 1648, which Sir William Playters and Sir Thomas Barnardiston were sent to put down. Hist. MSS. House of Lords. Seventh Report. Appendix 26 b.

† Among Lord Denbigh's papers is the copy of an order of the House of Peers that the army under Sir Thomas Fairfax is not to be quartered in the seven Associated Counties, and if already there, is to be removed. 'Die Sabbati 6. Martii,' 1646' (Hist. MSS. Commission, 4th Report).

chain before mentioned, and came within pistol-shot of their ordnance, proffering to fire upon their cannoneer, who fled, so they gained the two pieces of ordnance, and broke the chain, and they and the horse entered the town without more resistance. When presently eighteen strangers yielded themselves; among whom were of Suffolk men: Sir T. Barker, Sir John Petters of Norfolk, Mr. Knyvett of Ashwellthorpe, Mr. Richard Catelyn's son (some say his father was there in the morning), Mr. F. Cory, my unfortunate cousin, who I wish would have been better persuaded.*

Thus writes John Cory, addressing his letter 'to Sir John Potts, Knight Baronet, of Mannington, Norfolk; These, Laus Deo.' Carlyle adds: 'this was the last attempt at Royalism in the Association where Cromwell served. The "seven Associated Counties," called often the Association only, make a great figure in the old books, and kept the war wholly out of their own borders, having had a man of due forwardness among them.'

The reign of Charles II. was signalized by two great naval engagements fought off the coast of Suffolk. The first took place off Lowestoft, June 3rd, 1665, when the English fleet was commanded by James, Duke of York, and the Dutch by Cornelius Van Tromp. After seventeen hours' fighting the Dutch lost the day. Fourteen ships and 4000 men were destroyed, 18 ships and 2000 men taken. The second was the famous battle of Sole Bay, between the combined fleets of England and France under the Duke of York, Lord Sandwich, and the Comte d'Estrées on the one side, and the Dutch fleet under De Ruyter on the other. Lord Sandwich warned the Duke of York that the combined fleet was very dangerously and negligently placed. The Duke retorted that there was more of caution than of courage in his opinions. However, Sandwich's prudence saved the fleet, for hastening out of the bay, where the ships were crowded together, he gave time to the Duke and to the Comte d'Estrées to disengage themselves. Meanwhile Lord Sandwich threw himself into the thickest of the fight, and finally perished, his ship being blown up. The Dutch, night coming on, retired, but were not pursued by the English, the fact being that the loss had been about equal on either side. The French suffered very little, and an idea prevailed that they had secret orders to spare their ships, and to let the English and Dutch fight it out. The Duke of York's conduct in this engagement, and his neglect in succouring the Earl, were severely commented on; and in the debate on the Exclusion

* Carlyle: 'Oliver Cromwell's Letters, Speeches,' vol. i. p. 118.

Bill, in October 1680, he was openly charged in the House of Commons with being the occasion of his loss. So completely were the English taken by surprise, that many officers and sailors who were on shore at Dunwich, Aldeburgh, Southwold, &c., could not get on board their ships, although large sums of money were offered to take them off, but were obliged to remain spectators of the fight. Cornelius de Witte, who was present on this occasion,

'was seated on the deck of the ship, called the "Seven United Provinces," in a fine ivory chair, placed on an estrade covered with a magnificent carpet. He was dressed in a magistrate's robe, and surrounded with an officer, and twelve halberdiers in his own livery, with caps on their heads, decorated with blue and green ribbons. By this pompous appearance he pretended to add to the grandeur of the sovereignty of the states he represented, to have an opportunity of observing the motions of the fleet and the progress of the battle, to animate his men, and to render the dignity of plenipotentiary at sea equal to that of general at land both in splendour and authority.'—Campbell's 'Lives of the Admirals,' vol. ii. p. 192.

There is a quaint old ballad on the battle of Sole Bay, as it was called, beginning:—

'One day as I was sitting still
Upon the brow of Dunwich hill,
And looking on the ocean,
By chance I saw De Ruyter's fleet
With Royal James's squadron meet,
In truth it was a noble treat
To see that brave commotion.

* * * * *
The French, who should have joined the Duke,
Full far astern did lay and look,
Although their sterns were lighter;
But nobly faced the Duke of York,
Though some may wink, and some may talk,
Right stoutly did his vessel stalk
To buffet with De Ruyter.

* * * * *
So now we've seen them take to flight,
This way and that, where'er they might,
To windward or to leeward.
Here's to King Charles, and here's to James,
And here's to all the captains' names,
And here's to all the Suffolk dames,
And here's to the House of Stuart.*

* In the King's private dressing-room at Hampton Court is some tapestry representing this engagement.

Since those days Suffolk has been in the happy condition of a country without a history. But no sketch of its annals, however slight, would be complete without mention of two or three places which have not been alluded to, and of some of the great families and distinguished men connected with the county.

No place in Suffolk possesses a greater charm for the student of bygone days, or the moralizer on fallen greatness, than Dunwich. The relentless ravages of the ocean have reduced it, from being successively the seat of a bishopric, the most important seaport on this coast, and a parliamentary borough (returning two members down to 1832), to a mere fishing village, from which its sole remaining distinction, that of possessing a mayor and corporation, is about to be taken away. There seems little doubt that Dunwich was a Roman station, identified by some authorities as *Sitomagus* of the Antonine Itinerary, and traces may still be seen of a Roman road, called in later deeds the King's highway, leading right across the county from Dunwich to Bury St. Edmunds, which was probably the *Villa Faustini* of the Romans. The establishment of the first Bishopric in East Anglia by Sigebert (called the Learned), under Felix the Burgundian, has been already mentioned. Felix was for seventeen years Bishop of Dunwich: he would appear to have been a man of much wisdom and learning, as well as goodness, the friend and counsellor of successive sovereigns, and a most successful evangelizer. His fame spread abroad, and to him came one Fursey, an Irish monk, who founded, about 638, the monastery of Cnobbesburgh, on the site of the great Roman fortress of *Garionomum*,* now known as Burgh Castle.

The visions of S. Fursæus, as Fursey was afterwards called, are recorded by Bede, and Sir F. Palgrave, in his '*Normandy and England*' (vol. i. 163), thus speaks of them:—

'The stranger on the dank marshy shores of the oozy Yare, contemplating the lichen encrusted ruins of the Roman castramentation . . . scarcely supposes that those grey walls once enclosed the cell of an obscure anchorite, destined, so strangely is the chain of causation involved, to exercise a mighty influence equally upon the genius and dogma of Roman Christendom. This was the Milesian Scot Fursæus, who, received in East Anglia by King Sigebert, then became enwrapped in the trances which disclosed to him the secrets of the

* Mr. Suckling disputes the generally received notion, that *Garionomum* is identical with Burgh Castle. As usual, there is a great deal of '*Prætorium* here, *Prætorium* there,' among the authorities; but that it was a Roman station is indisputable; no Edie Ochiltree can say: '*I mind the biggin' o't.*'

world beyond the grave. . . . Fursæus kindled the spark, which transmitted to the inharmonious Dante of a barbarous age, occasioned the first of those metrical compositions from which the *Divina Commedia* arose.' (See also Baring-Gould's '*Lives of the Saints*,' vol. i. Jan. 16.)

Felix died in 647, his remains were removed from Dunwich to Soham, in Cambridgeshire, and thence to Ramsey Abbey, where his ashes were enshrined with splendour, and his name canonized as the first saint of the eastern part of England. Flixton (Felixton) and Felixstow recal it to this day.

Under Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury (669-690), the see of Dunwich was divided into two, the bishop of one to labour among the Southfolk from the old centre at Dunwich, while the other had his seat at Elmham,* in Norfolk. This arrangement lasted for 200 years, till the great Danish invasion in 870; from which date till about 956 there was no bishop at either place. The see of Dunwich was never filled again: at Elmham there was a regular succession of bishops from 950 to 1075, when the see was transferred to Thetford, and thence by Herbert Losinga to Norwich in 1094. Thus early Dunwich began to decline in rank, and by the time of Edward the Confessor was in a decaying state. It had lost its episcopal see and regal palace, and the sea had already begun its encroachments, and wasted a whole carucate of land.†

William the Conqueror gave Dunwich to Robert Malet, and from that time till the reign of Henry II. it seems to have steadily increased in prosperity; and is described as 'a town of good note, abounding with much riches, and sundry kinds of merchandize.' It was strongly fortified, and a MS. in the British Museum states that:—

'Robert Earl of Leciester, wh took part with Henry, the sonne of King Henry II., came to the said towne of Donwiche, to have taken it against the King. But when he came neere, and beheld the strength thereof, it was terror and feare unto him to behold it, and soe retyred, both him and his people.'

* Though Elmham, in Norfolk, is generally supposed to have been the site of the Bishop's see, yet some antiquarians have been inclined to fix it at South Elmham, in Suffolk, where are the ruins of an old Minster (see '*Journal of Suffolk Archæol. Soc.*,' vol. iv.).

† Stowe, and Gardner after him, maintain that Dunwich had a Mint. Stowe says: 'There hath been a Mint, many men of that towné can yet show of the coynes, which are sterling pence, with this inscription: "ciuitas Dunwich," 20 of which pence weighed an ounce, 12 ounces a pound Troy, and so being 20s. in money was also a pound in weight.' Weever also says ('*Funeral Monuments*,' p. 720): 'There was a mint in Dunwich, for one Master Holliday told me that he had a grothe, whose inscription on the one side was Ciuitas Donwic.' But Suckling utterly repudiates the notion.

Dunwich took part very warmly with King John in his struggle against the Barons, who on their part, says Holinshed, 'made, with the French, great havoc in Norfolk, extorting from Dunwich, to avoid a direption, great sums of money.' In Henry III.'s time Dunwich furnished 40 ships for the King's use; in the reign of Edward I. it maintained, besides 11 ships of war, 16 fair ships, 20 barks, or vessels trading to the North Seas, Iceland, &c., and 24 small boats for the home fishing. (Gardner.) Although its decline had already begun, Dunwich paid 47*l.* 10*s.* towards the sum of 6000*l.* settled upon Isabel of France on her marriage with Prince Edward, afterwards Edward II.; when Ipswich paid but 40*l.*

From this time forward the history of Dunwich is chiefly a history of encroachments of the sea: in the first year of Edward I. the old port was rendered utterly useless, in 1295 great part of the town and upwards of 400 houses with shops and windmills were destroyed; in 1677 the sea reached the market-place, when the townsmen sold the lead of the cross; in 1740 Gardner describes an awful storm, which did terrible damage. Of late years, however, the encroachments have been less serious, for though the Church of All Saints, the last of the six churches and three chapels known to have existed here, was dismantled about 1754, when it was thought it would soon share the fate of its predecessors, its ruins still crown the cliff. We must linger no longer at Dunwich, it has already occupied too large a share of these brief pages; but no one who has ever come under the spell of the place can forget it. Its grey, ivy-clad ruins are buried among the trees which form a sort of island of wood between the heath and the sea; the little fishing village nestles under the cliff, and round the whole place there lingers a halo of romance, an indefinable charm, which is well expressed in the following lines:—

' Oft gazing on thy craggy brow,
 We muse on glories o'er;
 Fair Dunwich, thou art lowly now,
 Renowned and sought no more.

How proudly rose thy crested seat,
 Above the ocean wave,
 Yet doomed beneath that sea to meet
 One wide and sweeping grave!

The stately city greets no more
 The home returning bark,
 Sad relics of her splendours o'er,
 One crumbling spire we mark.

Those

Those who through each forgotten age,
 With patient care still look,
 Will find her fate in many a page,
 Of Time's forgotten book.'

BIRD.

To mention all the distinguished families which have their birthplace in Suffolk, or are connected with the county, would lead us far beyond the limits of an article. The Howards have already been mentioned in connection with Framlingham.* Cavendish, near Sudbury, was the cradle of the noble family of Cavendish, who resided here till Sir William Cavendish married Bess of Hardwick, being the second of her four husbands, and migrated to Derbyshire. George Cavendish, of Glemsford, Sir William's elder brother, was Wolsey's faithful gentleman usher, and his biographer. His delightful life of Cardinal Wolsey was evidently known to Shakspeare when he wrote his play of Henry VIII.

Clare gave its name † to one of the greatest baronial families of the Middle Ages. The remains of a castle are still visible, which was probably a fortress before the Norman Conquest. King William gave it, with 94 other lordships in Suffolk, besides large possessions in many other counties, in all 170 lordships, to Richard FitzGilbert, whose grandfather was a natural son of Richard I. Duke of Normandy. His great-grandson, Richard de Clare, second Earl of Pembroke, was the famous Strongbow, the conqueror of Ireland, who gave his name to a portion of the country he had subdued, which is preserved to this day in Clare County. The title of Duke of Clarence, bestowed on Lionel, third son of Edward III., when he married the heiress of the De Clares, and the name of Clarencieux King of Arms (who with Norroy King of Arms, exercises heraldic dominion over all England—Norroy to the south, and Clarencieux to the north of the Trent), are also derived from Clare. Gilbert de Clare, fifth Earl of Hertford, and also Earl of Gloucester, was one of the twenty-five barons appointed to enforce the observance of Magna Charta; and his son and successor, Richard de Clare, was one of the chief nobles present in Westminster Hall, when Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, pronounced a solemn curse, with candles lighted, against all those who henceforth should violate Magna Charta. His son, again, Gilbert, called the Red (whose first

* East Winch, in Norfolk, was their original home.

† The signification of the name is uncertain, but it seems to be the same word that is found in Clarendon, in Wiltshire, and in the Yorkshire Wapentake of Clare.

wife

wi
 esp
 Mon
 the
 trea
 Her
 Eve
 Edw
 Edw
 was
 brot
 dial
 the
 linea
 the
 de C
 burn
 sister
 Rich
 a gre
 gave
 Lion
 Clare
 descr

Th
 Elizab
 Morti
 claim
 At
 round

* Isa
 married
 saw fit
 has reme
 Purse a
 lost whe
 * Queen

wife was Alice of Angoulême, niece of the King of France), espoused the cause of the Barons, and was knighted by Montford, Earl of Leicester, at the head of the army, just before the battle of Lewes. Dissatisfied, however, with Montford's treatment of him after the battle, he made his peace with Henry III., and fought on his side at the great battle of Evesham. His second wife was Joan of Acre, daughter of Edward I., so called because she was born at Acre when Edward and his wife were there during the Crusades.* She was buried at Clare in 1307 with great pomp, Edward II. her brother being present, and Weever gives a quaint rhymed dialogue 'between a secular asking, and a frere answering at the grave of Dame Johan of Acres,' giving an account of the lineal descent of the Lords of Clare, and of the foundation of the Augustinian Friars by Richard de Clare in 1248. Gilbert de Clare, the son of Joan of Acre, fell at the battle of Bannockburn, and his great inheritance was divided between his three sisters, of whom one, Elizabeth, married John de Burgh, son of Richard, Earl of Ulster, and was, if not the foundress, at least a great benefactress to Clare College, Cambridge, to which she gave her name. Her grand-daughter, another Elizabeth, married Lionel Duke of Clarence, before named, who is also buried at Clare. His character and appearance are thus quaintly described :—

'In all the world was there no Prince hym lyke,
Of hie stature, and of seemlinesse,
Above all men in his hole kingrike,
By the shulders he might be seen doubtlesse
As a mayde in halle of gentilness,
And in all places sen to Retorike,
And in the field a Lyon Marmorike.'

The only daughter of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, and Elizabeth de Burgh, Philippa Plantagenet, married Edward Mortimer, and through her the House of York derived its claim to the throne.

At Parham, the picturesque remains of the old hall, surrounded by a moat, and with a fine Tudor gateway, recal

* Isabella, the sixth daughter of Edward I. and Eleanore of Castille, was married at Ipswich in 1297 to the Count of Holland, on which occasion the King saw fit to throw the bride's coronet behind the fire; an ebullition of temper which has remained recorded in his Wardrobe Book, where the Keeper of the Privy Purse accounts for the sum expended to make good a large ruby and an emerald lost when 'the King's Grace was pleased to throw it behind the fire.'—Strickland's 'Queens of England.'

the family of Willoughby of Parham, a younger branch of the Lords Willoughby de Eresby, and distinguished by the part which several bearers of the title took in the wars in France in the reign of Henry V. and Henry VI. Christopher Willoughby, by his will, dated 1498, appointed 'that his body should be buried in the Church of the Nuns, at Campsey, in the county of Suffolk, before the high altar, where his father lay interred, bequeathing to the prioress there, twenty pounds; to every of the old nuns, six shillings and eightpence; to each of the young nuns, three shillings and fourpence.' It must have been a somewhat delicate matter to decide, in some cases, to which category the recipient belonged. In the reign of Henry VIII. the title came to William, Lord Willoughby, who took part in the invasion of Guyenne and the siege of Tournay, and was buried at Mettingham, in this county, leaving an only daughter, Catherine, by his wife, the Lady Mary Salines (as Collins calls her), or rather Donna Maria de Salazar, maid of honour to Katharine of Arragon. It was on behalf of this lady that Katharine wrote so piteously to her father, King Ferdinand, in September 1505, entreating him to command her to be paid, 'since I have nothing wherewith to pay her'! Lady Willoughby continued faithful to her unfortunate mistress, and, when she was dying, made her way, through terrible winter weather, to Kimbolton, and insisted on remaining with the Queen during her last hours, despite the opposition of the King's agents. Catherine, the daughter and heiress of Lord Willoughby, married, as his fourth wife, Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, the widower of Mary Tudor, sister to Henry VIII., and widow of Louis XII. After the death of the Duke of Suffolk, she married Richard Bertie, of Berstead in Kent; and their adventures, when compelled to leave England during the reign of Queen Mary on account of their devotion to the cause of the Reformation, are most curious. They are recorded in a quaint old ballad, called 'The Most Rare and Excellent History of the Dutchess of Suffolk and her husband Richard Bertie's Calamities.' After relating their escape from London, through Flanders, to Germany, with nurse and child, the 'History' continues:—

'Thus as they travell'd still disguised,
Upon the highway suddenly
By cruel thieves they were surprised,
Assailing their small company;
And all their treasures and their store
They took away, and beat them sore.

The

The nurse, in midst of all their fright,
 Laid down their child upon the ground,
 She ran away out of their sight
 And never after that was found ;
 Then did the dutchess make great moan
 With her good husband all alone.'

After vainly seeking for shelter, they are compelled to take shelter in a church porch, the church of S. Willebrode at Wesel, where a Latin inscription still records the truth of the story ; and there her son, Peregrine Bertie, was born. He was afterwards the 'brave Lord Willoughby' of the ballad, who so greatly distinguished himself in the Low Countries.* It is related, as a proof of his courage, that 'he offered to meet a person, who sent him a very impertinent challenge when he had the gout in his hands and feet, with a piece of a rapier in his mouth.' It was by the marriage of Peregrine, Lord Bertie, with Mary de Vere, aunt, and eventually heiress, of John, Earl of Oxford, that the Hereditary Great Chamberlainship of England passed into the family of Willoughby d'Eresby.

At Wingfield, some handsome remains are still to be seen of the castle, built by Michael de la Pole, first Earl of Suffolk of that family ; and the church contains a number of their monuments. Their connection with Suffolk began when Michael de la Pole married the heiress of Sir John de Wingfield, being himself the grandson of the 'beloved merchant' of Edward III., William de la Pole, of Kingston-upon-Hull, and the first instance of the accession to the peerage of a race of merchants. In Richard II.'s time, Michael de la Pole was made first Lord Chancellor, and then Earl of Suffolk, and had at the same time a grant of 1000 marks to maintain his dignity. This grant gave occasion for a somewhat telling retort on the part of Thomas Arundel, Bishop of Ely, at whose solicitation the temporalities of the see of Norwich, which had been sequestered, had been restored to Bishop Dispenser, the famous 'fighting Bishop' of Norwich. The Lord Chancellor remonstrated, saying :

"What is this, my lord, that you desire ? is it a small matter to part with those temporalities which yield the King more than £1000 per annum ? The King hath no need of such advisers to his loss." Whereupon the Bishop roundly replied, "What is that you say, Michael ? I desire nothing of the King which is his own, but that which belongs to another, and which he unjustly detains by thy wicked council, or such as thou art, which will never be to his advantage, I think. If thou bees't so much concerned for the King's

* See Motley's 'United Netherlands,' vol. ii. pp. 48, 515.

profit, why hast thou covetously taken from him a thousand marks per annum, since thou wast an earl?"

"Which expression," adds Dugdale, "soon silenced the Chancellor."

Michael gave some good advice to both Houses when they met in November 1384, telling them 'there were four ways or means which would greatly speed their consultations. First, to be early in the House: next, to repel all melancholy passions; the third, to begin always on the most needful enquiries, and to proceed without any mixture of orders; and lastly, to avoid all maintaining and partaking.'* He was, however, eventually impeached, and, after having been for some time imprisoned at Windsor, fled to Calais, and, disguised as a Flemish poulterer, carrying capons in a pannier, took refuge with his brother, who commanded the castle there, and finally died in exile.

A still more remarkable figure in English history was William de la Pole, first Duke of Suffolk—the Suffolk of Shakspeare's 'Henry VI.'—who is also buried at Wingfield; but his career, from the day when he was sent to espouse, as proxy for Henry VI., the beautiful Margaret of Anjou, is too long to recount in detail. His wife was Alice Chaucer, the poet's granddaughter, and Margaret's great friend. How far he was concerned in the murder of the Duke of Gloucester at Bury, it is difficult to say; but the general opinion laid it to his charge, as well as the loss of Henry V.'s conquests in France, and political ballads denounced him as 'the ape with his clog that had tied Talbot, the good dog that was longing to grip the Frenchman.' 'The King, hoping to save his life, sent him into banishment; he embarked at Ipswich, but was boarded by the captain of a ship-of-war belonging to the Duke of Exeter, and being brought into Dover Roads, had his head cut off on the side of the Cock boat,' (Dugdale.)

Not far from Wingfield is Stradbroke, said to be the birth-place of the famous Grostête, Bishop of Lincoln, and in the same neighborhood is Flixton, where was a fine old house, built by Inigo Jones, with which Charles II. was so struck when he passed it that he asked who lived there, and being told 'a popish dog,' replied, 'the dog has a very beautiful kennel.' The popish dog was one John Tasburgh, and the kennel was burnt down in 1846, but has since been rebuilt.

Ipswich is the county town, but there is not much to tempt us to linger there. The Duke of Buckingham's description of

* Maintenance and Champerty, the corruption of those days.

it to Charles II. as 'a town without inhabitants, a river without water, streets without names, and where the asses wore boots,' no longer applies. A very peculiar usage still in force at Ipswich is worth noting, namely the custom that empowers any child of the borough, male or female, who can reckon and count, and has attained the age of fourteen years, to part with land or freehold in the borough by deed, as though of the full age of twenty-one years.*

The banks of the Orwell, with their fine country places, such as Orwell † and Woolverstone on either side, wooded down to the water's edge, and the river crowded with shipping, are extremely pretty, and go far to redeem the county from the charge, often brought against it, of supreme ugliness. Gainsborough, when he lived at Ipswich, was especially fond of all this scenery, and often introduced it into his pictures. This distinguished painter was a native of Suffolk, being born at Sudbury, the son of a respectable trader there. One of his first achievements with his pencil was a somewhat ominous one: his father had refused to ask his master for a holiday; so he wrote, in exact imitation of his father's handwriting: 'Please give Tom a holiday,' and the holiday was secured accordingly. 'Tom will some day be hanged,' said his father, not unnaturally; but his mother produced some of his boyish drawings, and it ended in his being allowed to follow the bent of his genius. Constable, who also loved and painted Suffolk scenery—even his cows are of the Suffolk breed, without horns—was born at East Bergholt.

The names of several naval heroes are associated with this district: Thomas Cavendish, one of the earliest circumnavigators of the globe, was born at Grimston Hall, near Grimby St. Martin's; Admiral Vernon ‡ lived at Orwell; and Sir Philip Broke, the hero of the Chesapeake, at Brooke Hall.

Indeed, Suffolk has given birth to many distinguished men in every walk of life. Every one knows that Cardinal Wolsey was born at Ipswich, in all probability not the son of a butcher, though tradition still points out a bridge near Reydon which he is said to have built, having experienced the want of it when as a boy he was driving his father's cattle to market. The gateway of the college he founded at Ipswich is still standing, but the

* Hist. MSS. Commissioners, Ninth Report. App. 244 b.

† At Orwell is a small but very beautiful collection of pictures, among them a Murillo, 'The Healing of the Man at the Pool of Bethesda,' which Waagen considers to be the finest specimen of that master in England.

‡ The name of Admiral Vernon will ever be associated with that beautiful ballad, one of the finest in the English language, 'Admiral Hosier's Ghost.'—See Dr. Percy's 'Reliques of Ancient Poetry.'

college itself was swept away within two years of its foundation, being suppressed by Henry VIII. in 1538 on Wolsey's disgrace; Fuller says because the Cardinal had placed his own arms above those of the King on one of the gateways.

Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, was born at Bury St. Edmunds: 'one of the best aires in England,' says old Fuller, 'the sharpness whereof he retained in his quick wit and apprehension. His malice was like what is commonly said of white powder which surely discharged the bullet, yet made no report, being secrete in all his acts of cruelty. This made him often chide Bonner, calling him Asse, though not so much for killing poor people, as for not doing it more cunningly.' He acquired such a character for dissimulation that the saying went: 'my Lord of Winchester is like Hebrew, to be read backwards.' To enter into any detail about his life is impossible, for, like Wolsey's, it involves the whole history of England—in Gardiner's case during three reigns. But one thing may be related to his credit:—

'In Mary's time the Spanish ambassador submitted a plan to her by which she should be rendered independent of Parliament. Sending for Gardiner, she bade him peruse it, and adjured him, as he should answer at the judgment seat of God, to speak his real sentiments concerning it. "Madam," replied the Chancellor, "it is a pity so virtuous a lady should be surrounded by such sycophants. The book is naught, it is filled with things too horrible to be thought of."—Burnet,' ii. 278.

An equally brief mention must suffice for Nicholas Bacon, the father of Lord Bacon, and Elizabeth's trusted Lord Keeper, who, though not born in the county, was of a Suffolk family, and lived at Redgrave, where, as well as at Gorhambury, the Queen visited him. It was on her visit to Redgrave, that she observed that his house was too small for him; upon which he discreetly replied: 'No so, madam, but your Highness has made me too great for my house.'

The three poets of Suffolk, very different both in station and the subjects they selected, are Sir John Suckling, Crabbe, and Bloomfield. Sir John Suckling belonged to the family of that name still settled at Barsham. He made a campaign under Gustavus Adolphus, and raised a splendid troop of horse, at the expense of 12,000*l.*, for the service of Charles I. This troop, with Sir John Suckling at its head, behaved so ill in the engagement with the Scots upon the English borders in 1639, as to occasion the famous lampoon, composed by Sir John Mennis, which being set to a brisk tune was much sung by the

the
his
at
tin
cou
Hi
Ro
Ho
wh

It
exis
and
excit
piling
appr
view
the
poeti
lot of
as th
which
love
last c
Blo
his b
than
Nor
of the
Ossor
folio v
wards
'Gam
sented
ing-son

But

Vol.

the Parliamentarians. It is supposed that the ridicule attending his disastrous expedition hastened his death, which took place at Paris in 1641. He was one of the finest gentlemen of his time, and both his poems and prose works, notably his 'Discourse of Religion,' addressed to Lord Dorset, have great merit.* His 'ballad on a wedding,' occasioned by the marriage of Robert Boyle, first Earl of Orrery, with Lady Margaret Howard, daughter of the first Earl of Suffolk, has one verse which has been often quoted :—

' Her feet beneath her petticoat,
Like little mice stole in and out,
As if they feared the light ;
But oh ! she dances such a way,
No sun upon an Eastern day
Is half so fine a sight."

It is impossible to imagine a greater contrast than that which exists between the lives and works of Suckling, the soldier and the man of fashion, and of George Crabbe, the son of the exciseman at Aldeburgh, who was at one time employed in piling up butter-casks on Slaughden Quay, and at another was apprenticed to a surgeon at Woodbridge. He took a gloomy view of life, and in the short tales contained in the 'Village' and the 'Parish Register,' strips off with a relentless hand the vague poetic fancies with which imagination sometimes surrounds the lot of the poor. His work on Nature is as minute and accurate as that of a Dutch painter, and within the narrow limits to which it was confined had a great effect in stimulating the love both of nature and of man, which towards the end of the last century began to awaken in English literature.

Bloomfield has already been mentioned in connection with his birthplace ; his poems of rural life are far more cheerful than Crabbe's, and combine both humour and pathos.

Nor must we omit a passing allusion to John Bale, a native of the little village of Cove, near Dunwich, and Bishop of Ossory, who wrote the first biography of English writers in two folio volumes, and to John Stele, Rector of Hadleigh, and afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells, who wrote in his youth, 'Gammer Gurton's Needle,' the first true English play, represented in Christ's College, c. 1565, with its well-known drinking-song, beginning :—

' I love no roste but a nut-brown toste.'

But these rambling pages must be brought to a conclusion,

* See Granger's 'Biographical History of England.'
Vol. 164.—No. 328.

though much still remains to be told : in truth, the history of any county is of inexhaustible interest. We must not linger by the moated hall at Helmingham, where the drawbridge is still drawn up every night, and which is still held by the Tollenaches, of whom the old rhyme runs :—

‘ When William the Conqueror reigned with great fame,
Bentley was my seat, and Talmash was my name ;

nor at Henham, where the fine old Elizabethan mansion, the seat of the De la Poles and of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, was burnt down a hundred years ago, but where the oak still stands in which Sir John Rous, the Loyalist, was concealed by his wife from the pursuit of the Roundheads ; nor at Cockfield, where the unfortunate Lady Katherine Grey, sister to Lady Jane, died a prisoner for the unpardonable crime (in Queen Elizabeth’s eyes) of having married Lord Hertford. Not even Sir Symonds d’Ewes must tempt us to linger at Stowlangtoft, though his ‘ short way ’ in the House of Commons of moving that a certain Member (Serjeant Armstrong) ‘ do now hold his peace ’ would be of great use at the present day ; and there is something very attractive in his quaint autobiography, in which his legal and antiquarian proclivities mingle strangely with his courtship, when he boasts that the lady possessed the smallest foot in England ; and then announces that ‘ his very study of records grew more delightful and pleasant than ever before, as he often met with several particulars of moment which concerned some of those families to which she was heir, both of their bloods and coat armour.’

Sir Symonds d’Ewes was one of those invaluable Dryasdusts of whom Carlyle speaks so contemptuously, but without whose patient and laborious researches no history could be written. He was the first person who made collections for the history of the county of Suffolk, and his papers are preserved among the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum. It is much to be hoped that a Nicholls or an Ormerod may yet arise to make use of these, and the many other materials which exist for the history of a county so rich in interest. The instinct which prompts us all to wish to know something of the great events connected with places and districts with which we are personally acquainted is one well worthy of cultivation, and, without wishing to return to the Heptarchy, which would almost seem to be the tendency of some of the leading statesmen of the day, it will be a sad day for England when a Suffolk or a Devonshire or a Northamptonshire man ceases to take a pride in his own county.

ART.

ART. V.—*Hobbes*. By George Croom Robertson, Grote Professor of Mind and Logic in University College, London. Edinburgh and London, 1886.

IF no man is a hero to his valet, his prestige recovers itself in the hands of his biographer. Mr. Robertson, impressed with the prowess of Hobbes in the department over which he so ably presides in University College, London, would rescue the philosopher from the obscurity into which he has fallen. The public are already indebted to Mr. Robertson for an exhaustive paper on Hobbes in the last edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' The present volume contains nothing new, though we are informed the materials have been largely recruited from a close examination of the Hardwick MSS. But these documents, frequently exploited for the same purpose, have been left very much in the condition of a squeezed orange. Since Aubrey's narrative, we are able to avouch from a personal inspection, that not a shred of fact can be extracted from them of the slightest interest to the public. Mr. Robertson, therefore, in the absence of more attractive materials, has to fall back upon the philosopher's works, of which he enters into a detailed analysis. But too close a survey of greatness somewhat detracts from its height; this is notably so with Hobbes, whose elaborate workmanship rather oddly contrasts with the flimsy basis upon which his philosophic structure has been raised. To undertake a close inspection of the work must infallibly lead to his disparagement. Mr. Robertson's labours, therefore, are calculated to produce the opposite effect to his aims. If the late Sir William Molesworth injured Hobbes's reputation by editing every tract the philosopher ever published, Mr. Robertson brings him into still further discredit by presenting the tinsel as genuine ore from the mine of true philosophy.

No man ever published so much as Hobbes, and wrote so little. The titles of his works remind one of those theatrical supernumeraries who, by constantly crossing the stage in changed habiliments, contrive to represent a large army. His 'De Cive' was published in 1642. A few years later this work, cut into two halves, reappeared under the guise of 'Human Nature' and 'De Corpore Politico,' or the 'Elements of Law, Moral and Politic'—an adaptation of the title applied to his first treatise on the same subject. His optical tracts, first separately issued, and portions of his 'Human Nature,' stitched together without any other connection than the binding, appeared in 1658 under the title of 'De Homine.' In the 'De Corpore Politico' is repeated the Christian commonwealth of the 'Leviathan,' which in turn

contains all he had previously published in the 'De Cive.' His geometrical speculations, which first appeared in strange conjunction with his logic and first philosophy in the 'De Corpore,' were afterwards ushered into the world as revelations of startling significance. Indeed Hobbes, by presenting his old works under new combinations, contrived every two or three years to explode some literary cracker in the ear of the public. This frequent repetition of himself was, to some extent, brought about by his attempt to produce a complete system of philosophy under a tripartite division, the members of which included each other. The coping-stone of Hobbes's system was 'The Citizen;' 'Man' formed the central part, while the treatise on Body supplied a foundation for the entire structure. It was, therefore, competent for Hobbes, under each of these divisions, to write about every part of the material universe, and he largely availed himself of the privilege of dosing his readers several times over with the same subject. The branches of his system, first completed without reference to each other, were afterwards forced into coherence. Everything was taken up as caprice or the pressure of social affairs dictated. The tumults which led to the outbreak of 1642 impelled him to write his 'Citizen.' His 'De Corpore' was not even designed till ten years afterwards. That the building was grotesque, that the parts of the structure set at defiance all the laws of organic unity, need not excite wonder. For Hobbes raised the dome before he thought of the foundations.

Both biographer and editor seem to have thought that because Hobbes was proficient in mental analysis, his performances in other departments of knowledge are equally worthy of transmittal to posterity. But this resembles the vulgar notion, that because a man is an adept at the German flute, his performances on the clarionet must be equally worthy of public attention. Hobbes's labours in the field of mental philosophy only occupy a very small section of his works, as the subject itself filled up only a nook of his mind. The great brunt of his efforts, in fact the best part of his life, was spent upon the elaboration of physical, mathematical, and political theories at war with common sense. The results of his ethical and theological speculations were equally inane. Hobbes neglected the sphere of mental science, in which he was most competent to shine, for others in which he cut a ludicrous figure, and his admirers have repeated the mistake by cherishing his failures with the same fervency with which they proclaim his success. Hobbes was an acute logician. But by his assumption of wrong principles the very force and energy of his reasoning only carried him further

from

from the truth. His mathematical and physical treatises have been long swept into the limbo of absurdities. The limpid purity of his style, however, the keenness of his intellect, and his dogmatic vigour of expression, have leavened his political errors with a salt which still preserves them from corruption. The giant in mental became a dwarf in material philosophy. There is no European writer whose works so fully exhibit the weakness as well as the strength of the human intellect.

The facilities for culture accorded to Hobbes are enjoyed by few, and he certainly was not remiss in turning them to account. The spirit of the old monks of Malmesbury, where he first saw the light (5th April, 1588), seems early to have stirred in his veins. His father, the rector of the place, initiated him betimes into the mysteries of Greek Iambics. In his fourteenth year he entered Magdalen College, Oxford. Hobbes took his Bachelor's degree in the usual course, and upon the recommendation of the President of Magdalen became tutor at the early age of twenty to young Cavendish, eldest son of the Earl of Devonshire. This step might have taught Hobbes the uses of an aristocracy, for by the beneficence of that family he was enabled in tumultuous times to continue his studies in quiet for upwards of two generations. With his pupil, Hobbes travelled through France and Italy, loitering for months in continental capitals to learn the manners as well as the language of men by social intercourse with their chiefs. On their return to England, Hobbes took up his residence with the family at Chatsworth, and employed his leisure upon the translation of Thucydides. This, his first literary effort, was undertaken to expose the follies of the Athenian democracy, as a check to the revolutionary spirit at that time arising in England. The old Earl of Devonshire died in March 1625. Hardly three years after, the young Earl followed his father. Hobbes, deprived first of his patron, then of his pupil and companion, accepted the invitation of Sir Gervase Clifton to accompany his son to the Continent, whence after a sojourn of some eighteen months he was recalled by the Dowager Countess of Devonshire to undertake the education of the young Earl, then a lad of thirteen. With the son of his former pupil he paid his third visit to France and Italy, where he made the acquaintance of Galileo, and applied himself to the study of the Mechanical Philosophy, which he subsequently regarded as the mainspring of the universe. In 1634 we find Hobbes studying Physics in Paris with Gassendi, and coming to the same conclusion as the monk, that thought was as much a mechanical process as digestion. In 1637 he returned with the young Earl to England, then torn by civil commotions. To support the
Royal

Royal prerogative, he, in a small tract intended for private circulation, broached the theory, that an absolute monarchy was essential to the welfare of the people.* But the violent proceedings of the Long Parliament (1640) showed Hobbes that the dispute was rapidly passing from arguments to blows, and at the end of 1640, out of fear for his personal safety, he sought refuge in Paris.

While the combatants were measuring swords in the field, Hobbes sought to bring the rebels within the bounds of passive obedience by speculations in the closet. During the first years of his exile, his thoughts were directed to this subject as the crowning apex of the grand scheme of philosophy he designed for the world. With this view, he expanded the 'Elements of Law, Natural and Politique,' into the 'De Cive,' of which he printed a few copies in 1642. This work was further elaborated by Hobbes into the 'Elementa Philosophica de Cive,' which was passed through the Elzevir press by Sorbière, and published at Amsterdam in 1647. Sir Charles Cavendish, brother to the Duke of Newcastle, was Hobbes's constant friend in Paris, through whom he obtained a footing at Court. In 1648, during a short stay of Descartes in that capital, Hobbes, at the Duke of Newcastle's, met that philosopher whose 'Du Monde' and 'Method' had already startled Europe. Descartes visited Paris in 1643-4; but whether Hobbes then met Descartes or not, he was acquainted with his treatises. As Descartes had balanced everything on the subjective element, it may have occurred to Hobbes that an equal reputation was to be achieved by resolving everything into the objective element. At all events, this was the scheme he had already mapped out in his mind. Hobbes's leisure in Paris was divided between the laboratories of Mersenne and Gassendi and the salons of the Court party. It certainly reflects no little credit on the Royalists, that they should have admitted to their tables, on terms of perfect equality, one who had nothing to recommend him but his genius. Hobbes's appointment as mathematical tutor to the Prince of Wales bound him still further to the Court. But when the Royalist cause was becoming desperate in England, and Charles withdrew to Holland (1648), Hobbes began to give freer range to his thoughts. The result was the production of the 'Leviathan,' a sort of compendium of his system before the parts of it, with the exception of the 'De Cive,' had been given to the world. Absolutism was founded on democracy. The divine right of Kings was shattered to pieces. The Church's pre-

* 'Elements of Law, Natural and Politique.' Two copies in the British Museum, Harl. MS. 4235-6.

tensions were demolished. Charles II. had this nosegay presented to him by Hobbes, written in a fair text, and bound in vellum,* after his return from the fatal field of Worcester (1651). Hobbes afterwards was forbidden the Royal presence. The Court party shunned him as one tainted with treason: even Gassendi and the philosophic Fathers, with whom he had been on terms of genial intercourse, withdrew their countenance from a man who had described their religion as the inheritance of Satan.† Hobbes therefore flew to England at the close of 1651, haunted by the same terrors which drove him from it eleven years before. The publication of the 'Leviathan' in London (1651) had prepared the way for his arrival and security in that capital. In 1651 Hobbes translated the 'De Cive' into English. The year previous, while in Paris, he divided this treatise into two portions, which he published under the titles of 'Human Nature,' and 'De Corpore Politico, or the Elements of Law, Moral and Politic.' These two tracts, in conjunction with that on Liberty and Necessity, which first saw the light in 1654, he called his Tripos. It was not till 1655 that he completed his 'De Corpore.' The 'De Homine' followed three years later. But this only consisted of a treatise on optics, with the same account of the speech, appetites, and passions of man, to justify the title, which he had often propounded many years before. After a short stay in London he withdrew to Chatsworth, whence, in the bosom of the Devonshire family, he launched his darts at the Savilian professors and other assailants who disturbed his repose.

At the Restoration, Hobbes came to London, and obtained an annual pension of 100*l.* from Charles. But in 1666 the 'Leviathan,' and the 'De Cive' were censured by Parliament, and a Bill passed against Atheism and Profaneness, which alarmed him very much. But if he suffered the inconveniences, he also enjoyed the honours, of greatness. In 1669 he was visited by Cosimo de' Medici, who requested his portrait, and caused a complete collection of his writings to be deposited in the Florentine Library, where they still arrest the attention of the curious. No distinguished foreigner thought his visit to England complete unless he conversed with the man whose writings were the talk of Europe; yet in a few years these were destined to be as neglected as last week's newspaper. Hobbes's reputation was discounted for him during life; he was in this respect the antithesis of his great contemporary Milton, who, at the time when Hobbes was in everybody's mouth, lived neglected and

* The book is in the Egerton MS. 1910, British Museum.

† 'Leviathan,' part iv.

despised

despised in a garret. But the mind of the age was immature, being distracted by too many novel theories to bestow upon any literary venture the amount of attention requisite to gauge its merits. Hence Hobbes's absurd translation of Homer was received with enthusiasm, while 'Paradise Lost' fell still-born from the press. The four books of the 'Odyssey,' which appeared in 1674, were so successful that he completed the whole of Homer in the three following years. But Hobbes did not allow his old antipathies to be assuaged by the Muses. For, about 1668, he further evinced his enmity to Churchmen by writing in Latin elegiacs an Ecclesiastical History, with a view to expose the arts by which priests, as he alleged, with tools borrowed from the ancient philosophies, sought to undermine the foundations of the civil power: a work capriciously undertaken, which confounded the relations of science and poetry, and was doomed to be left unfinished. To this period is to be referred the Latin poem detailing the events of his own life. In 1666-7, Hobbes wrote a 'History of the Causes of the Civil Wars,' which he christened 'Behemoth,' from the book of Job, whence he had previously taken 'Leviathan' for the same purpose, to deify the might of kingly prerogative.* The work was submitted to Charles II. in 1668, and by him flatly proscribed. It, however, stole into print in 1678, a year before its author's death; Professor Robertson adds, surreptitiously; but it is somewhat remarkable that people should always be found unknown to Hobbes, who at their own risk kept his name before the public, when it was not convenient for him to appear himself. In this work Hobbes censures the Royalists for turning an absolute into a limited monarchy, and the constitutional lawyers for placing fetters on the Royal prerogative. Sir Edward Coke, who had died in 1634, was rebuked by Hobbes on this account. In a dialogue between a philosopher and student, on 'The Common Laws of England,' which Hobbes, about 1666, left unfinished, this censure is very freely expressed. But Sir Mathew Hale came to the rescue. The Chief Justice of the Common Pleas ruthlessly exposed Hobbes's misconceptions of English History, and, with prophetic eye, accused him, by investing the Crown with false attributes, of luring it to its own destruction. Hobbes was represented like another Judas, as betraying monarchy with a kiss.† Hobbes, indeed, took up no subject without incurring the ire of those who were professed masters of it. His notions of law were obnoxious to the Judges;

* Job iii. 40, 41.

† Harleian MS. 711, British Museum, a work which has escaped the minute vigilance of Professor Robertson.

his divinity brought down upon him the thunders of the Bishops ; his mathematics were derided by the Oxford Professors ; his physics were repudiated by the Royal Society. But the hoary veteran always came up smiling, even after defeat, feeling confident that his losses would be ultimately balanced by his triumphs. With spare diet and methodical living, with an inkhorn at the end of his walking-cane and a tablet in his pocket, Hobbes never quailed before his promiscuous assailants. His last piece, the '*Decameron Physiologicum*,' completed in his ninetieth year, comprises a new set of dialogues on physical questions, with a demonstration of the equality of a straight line to the arc of a circle, thrown in at the end, to show that he was as staunch as steel to his vain theory of squaring the circle. But the old fire shone through a worn-out tenement. Hobbes was more troubled by attacks within, than from assaults without. In his sixtieth year, palsy had unnerved his hand. The disorder increased as his physical powers waned. In the middle of October, 1679, he was seized with strangury. When told there was little chance of recovery, he expressed himself glad to find a hole by which at last he could creep out of the world. At length, when the Devonshire family were leaving Chatsworth for Hardwicke, some fifteen miles distant, Hobbes, in fear of phantom enemies, objected to be left behind. While conveyed on a litter to Hardwicke he was smitten with paralysis on his right side, which terminated his existence in his ninety-second year (4th December, 1679).

As Hobbes mainly challenged the attention of the public by his civil policy, his reputation is chiefly identified with his works on that subject. The '*Leviathan*,' as well as the '*De Cive*,' is an attempt to evolve by necessary sequence out of universal axioms the results of his actual experience. Hobbes lived through a period when a moral earthquake was undermining the institutions of the two leading countries of Europe. He grew up under the rule of Elizabeth. He beheld the popular despotism of Elizabeth shaken to pieces in the hands of her pedantic successor and his vacillating son. He witnessed the excesses of the Long Parliament degenerate into a phantom republic. He saw that republic absorbed by the iron rule of Cromwell. He lived through the storms which carried the nation from the depths of canting demagoguery to the heights of kingly adulation. He survived the popularity of Charles II. He had witnessed the prosperity of France under the firm sway of Richelieu trampled in the dust by the licence of the Fronde. The political panorama of his own times powerfully supported the lesson he had derived from the Thucydidean fragment of Greek history.

Both

Both equally impressed him with the notion, that democratic licence is the chief agent in the dissolution of states, and that the stability of the social edifice can only be secured under the wings of a rigid despotism. The respective decaying and conserving tendencies of the two opposite principles appeared to Hobbes to spring out of the natural condition of things by laws as inflexible as the Greek Fates. This was the doctrine that we have seen in our generation reduced to practice by Napoleon III., when he appealed to the plebiscite for a restoration of the Empire. Indeed, Hobbes's despotism, like that of both Napoleons, rested on no other basis than that of the people's suffrage. This was the very talisman by which Hobbes and his Cæsarean copyists strove to gain the affections of the community. Hobbes sought to conciliate both parties at the revolution—the Crown, by exalting its prerogatives, the people, by making the Crown the puppet of its will. Cromwell, as well as Charles, must have been gratified to find their governments established by the same fatality which wheels a spheroid round its axis and guides a planet in its course. The people were equally flattered by the notion that the despotism, of which they were the vassals, sprang out of the voluntary sacrifice for their own benefit of the dangerous gift of unfettered liberty.

The mistake which Hobbes committed was in constructing a civil polity for every stage of society, which was only adapted to a special phase of it. His more immediate aim was to devise the best form of government for England, and he took his principles from, as he applied his framework to, revolutionary epochs which only occur in his own country once, perhaps, in twenty generations. The vices of democracy impelled him into absolutism, just as the vices of absolutism, had he restricted his attention to them, might have driven him back into democracy. The demagogues of the Long Parliament, like their Athenian prototypes, were a bad lot. But were the Roman Emperors any better? Livy might have informed Hobbes that only in very exceptional periods of tumult and danger, the strongest empire the world ever saw submitted itself to the uncontrolled sway of one man; that, in its normal state, the Roman government, like our own, consisted of a series of checks and counter-checks, by which the interests of each class were promoted so far as conducive to the welfare of the whole. But Hobbes, with his usual exclusiveness, did not look beyond the revolutionary events passing before him, for the facts and reasonings upon which he based his policy. The English tumults did not spring from the want of absolute power in any one member of the State, but in each usurping the province of

the

the other. The Parliament encroached upon the prerogatives of the King, as the King took on himself the functions of Parliament. To assume that, because the advent of a dictator was necessary to restore the social fabric in periods of anarchy, his presence as its guardian was required for all time, was repeating the mistake of the man, who, because he found rhubarb and senna useful in time of sickness, adopted that regimen as a normal article of his diet.

The origin of Hobbes's Commonwealth is quite of a piece with the exceptional circumstances which led to its structure. The natural state of man was one of savage warfare. Each individual was a freebooter. As he recognized no law, he was restrained by no authority. To escape from incessant strife, men entered into a compact with one another to surrender their absolute rights to a sovereign clothed with all the attributes of despotism. The sovereign was the commonwealth. The power of the State, like that of the individuals out of which it arose, was only restricted by its resources; and it had licence to do anything. Such was the origin of civil society. Rousseau took the same view, but described the compact in favour of liberty. Instead of erecting *Imperium* upon the ruins of Liberty, both Empire and Liberty appeared in the same fabric as essential supports of each other. The State, with Rousseau, was a large unlimited liability company: men surrendered their powers to a central authority upon condition that they should, as joint members of the corporate body, have a voice in determining its decisions. Hobbes occasionally describes the contract as one between governor and governed, to suit the case of a conqueror and his subjects; but in shifting the basis, he destroys even the appearance of a covenant. For while by this alleged contract subjects are bound to obey their sovereign, sovereigns are under no correlative obligations to their subjects. Indeed, it was to overturn this slavish doctrine that Hooker and Locke set up a primary contract between ruler and people, based upon the performance of reciprocal duties. Their views were endorsed by the statesmen of the revolution. Three-quarters of a century before Rousseau wrote his 'Contrat Social,' the Convention Parliament of William had affirmed an original contract between king and people, by the violation of which James had lost his throne. Upon that contract, they asserted, the English Constitution was based. But Rousseau insists that before a people can become a people, they must enter into a contract of association, such as he describes, for that purpose.* Thus,

* 'Du Contrat Social,' chap. vi. and vii.

there-

there are contracts within contracts. For the foundations of society in periods of chaotic convulsion, we are by these authorities referred to proceedings which usually take place inside an acute conveyancer's office. To support one chimera, another still more startling is evoked to keep it in countenance.

History knows nothing of men existing in an isolated state of savage warfare. Even the troglodytes were members of a tribe. The lowest social factors are families spreading into clans. The embryo of commonwealths is engendered in a whirlwind of violence and confusion. Their birth is a matter not of pacts and conventions, but of outrage and tumult.

Neither Hobbes, nor Rousseau, nor Locke, afford us any light as to the date of the contract, or whether it was entered into before the invention of symbols, or was one merely of a verbal character. But even if the compact had been in writing, and the document had been transmitted, hermetically sealed, to future generations, it would only have bound the men who actually subscribed it. Thus, the reader is driven back to other principles of a far wider nature, as a ground of civic obligation. But Hobbes in this matter laboured under a double delusion. For if a mob of people agree to transfer their powers to an irresponsible authority, where is the consideration for their promise? The agreement would be a mere *nudum pactum*, of no binding force or efficacy. The only ground which Hobbes could assign for the keeping of such a promise was the mischief which would arise from men violating their word. We are thus brought round to utility as the ground of submission to the law, and this Hobbes might have directly assumed as the basis of society without resting its existence on a fictitious promise. The old Jurists rested the obligation of civic obedience on the ground of the Divine law. But of this law Hobbes denied the existence; with him the State alone was the creator of Justice and Equity. The rustic may be excused for mistaking a canal for a river; but Hobbes fell into the delusion, which Byron ascribed to the Westmoreland poets, of mistaking lake for ocean.

This blunder crept through the politics of Hobbes into the pages of Rousseau, and, through Rousseau, saturated with blood the politics of the Revolution. Both writers invest man in his savage state with unfettered powers. He is bound by no law. He is free to satisfy all his desires. Upon surrendering his liberty to the State, he invests it with all the prerogatives he enjoyed, that the State may use them according to its conception of the common welfare. The State, therefore, is absolutely unlimited; it owns no superior; whatever lies within the range of its power, it may accomplish. The only

difference

diffe
admi
share
says
reme
quen
exag
But
ciple
shoul
cracy
De
spon
day h
doy,
reviv
views
could
sophi
down
and to
comm
faith i
every
is evi
charac
philos
relatio
the sch
Hobbe
which
despot
rule.
passes
democ
classes
founda
that H
the Fre
govern
used a
control
absolut
would
of enlig

difference between Rousseau and Hobbes consisted in the one admitting the people to, and the other excluding them from, a share in the godlike attributes of the State. Professor Robertson says that Hobbes's opponents never did him the justice to remember, that his design was to bar out the anarchic consequences of the egoist principle in man which he had so much exaggerated, by strengthening the hands of the civil power. But it does not speak much for his prescience that the principles he so carefully laid down for the security of despotism should be afterward applied by letting loose the flood of democracy over Europe.

Despite Hobbes's advocacy of monarchy, absolute and irresponsible, he has found in the philosophical Radicals of our day his staunchest advocates. Grote has guaranteed his orthodoxy, Austin defended his views of moral justice, Molesworth revived his doctrines, the two Mills espoused his philosophical views, and all more or less have eulogized the spirit, if they could not adopt the letter, of his political treatises. 'The philosophical Radicals,' says Professor Robertson, 'from James Mill downwards, have been able to pierce through the veil of accident, and to see in Hobbes a man who had the same regard for the common weal as the true aim of human action, and the same faith in intelligence as the one means of realizing it.' But as every political writer is guided by motives equally patriotic, it is evident we must look deeper than empty phrases of this character for the ground of sympathy between Hobbes and the philosophical Radicals. That sympathy reposes on a common relationship between the tenets of Hobbes and the principles of the school which have made such efforts to propagate his views. Hobbes begins his political speculations with the broad assertion, which he never attempts to prove, that all men are equal. The despotic authority he sets up levels all classes beneath its iron rule. To that authority the power of the sovereign people passes by plurality of suffrage. The three corner-stones of modern democracy, viz.: Individual equality, abolition of privileged classes, and universal suffrage, are laid down by Hobbes as the foundation of absolute monarchy. But Grote and Austin assert, that Hobbes's monarchy was identical with that maintained by the French economists of the last century as the perfection of government, in which the King, controlled by intelligent subjects, used all his powers for their exclusive benefit. But a monarchy controlled, in any sense, by the popular wishes, ceases to be absolute, and had Hobbes set up such a monarchy in theory, it would have been constantly belied by experience. The adage of enlightened absolutism is everything for, but nothing by, the people.

people. This monarchy, with which Austin and Grote would identify that of Hobbes and the French economists, is one bound to seek the advice and gratify the wants of its subjects; to instruct the people in the rudiments of moral and political science; and to adapt the institutions of the country to the people's notions of the general good.* But Hobbes's monarchy was bound by no such obligations; its absolute rights were unfettered by the slightest vestige of restraint. It was the fountain of law and justice; and the people were obliged to yield to it unlimited obedience. Against these doctrines as embodying the creed of tyrants, the Radicals have struggled with all the force of their nature; but their philosophical brethren, according to Professor Robertson, see nothing in them but accidental properties, springing out of their fundamental maxims, just as they agree with Hobbes 'in manifesting that faith in intelligence as the means of realizing good government' by stifling the voice of the cultured classes amid the confused uproar of an illiterate suffrage.

The philosophical Radicals are doughty advocates of complete separation between Church and State; whereas Hobbes would bind the Church in State fetters, and make her the mere creature of the temporal power. This is another accidental antithesis under which there lies a wide basis of agreement. For Hobbes, by subjecting man's spiritual instincts to State control, by making the monarch the arbiter of the religious feelings of the subject, sets up conflicting creeds in different countries as legitimate channels of inspiration. This indifference to forms of faith induces the philosophical Radicals to embrace Hobbes with enthusiasm. Hence, a free Church in a free State is equally objectionable, both to them and Hobbes. For the State has a right to dispose of the destinies of its subjects, and to trample out their theological beliefs whenever they obstruct its notions of civic regeneration. Hobbes has been usually denounced as an Atheist; but Grote and Austin assure us that not one grain of scepticism is to be found in his writings. Both indeed declare that Hobbes always speaks of the Deity with the greatest reverence. Professor Robertson follows much in the same strain. The garrulous Aubrey, whom the Professor quotes, tells us how Hobbes, falling sick in Paris (1647), received the sacrament from the hands of Dr. Cosins, afterwards Bishop of Durham, and would allow no devotions to be used but such as the English Common Prayer-book prescribes. This, in Professor Robertson's view, establishes

* Austin's 'Province of Jurisprudence determined,' vol. i. p. 248.

Hobbes's

Hobbes's orthodoxy on a firm basis. But Hobbes's timidity in sight of death ill accords with that 'rationalistic criticism' which the Professor tells us, in another place, Hobbes framed, with the object of 'barring out the pretensions of all the Churches, whether Papal, Anglican or Presbyterian.' Hobbes certainly assumes the existence of God in his writings, but as to His nature or attributes he denies that we can know anything about Him. Indeed, he assures us in the '*Leviathan*,' that of the Infinite we can have no idea or conception.* Hobbes's reputation for Atheism, which is ascribed by the philosophical Radicals to the malice of his enemies, springs from his own creed. 'Nothing exists but matter and force.' 'The only thing we can know of Deity is that it exists.' The conclusion irresistibly follows, that God is nothing but the blind nature of material things pervading the universe.

'Estne Dei sedes nisi terra, pontus, et aër,
Et cœlum, et virtus? superos quid quærimus ultra?
Jupiter est quodcunque vides, quocunque moveris.' †

Hence Hobbes's law of invincible necessity and his deification of force. It is true when treating of the Christian Commonwealth,‡ or dealing with Scripture, Hobbes speaks of the Deity as if he was as familiar with the Divine attributes as Moses or Abraham. But in Hobbes's day everything was proved from the Bible, and Hobbes could not have recourse to that recondite source of authority without assuming as true the fundamental facts upon which the sacred record rests. Indeed, he could not dispute with his theological adversaries at all, unless by conceding the personal existence of the Deity, as a sort of common ground upon which human reasoning is based. But, read by the light of Hobbes's philosophy, all this scriptural phraseology was conventional language, and nothing more, assumed for the purpose of convincing an age who would believe nothing except a scriptural text was behind it. Otherwise Hobbes's speech would be a jargon which no one could understand; his philosophy would contradict his religion, and his religion would outrage common-sense. But peering through his theological investiture his real views occasionally manifest themselves; for he does not scruple to inform his readers that religion takes its rise chiefly in fear and ignorance, which by reason of the different fancies, judgments, and passions of men, hath grown up into ceremonies so different, that those which are used by one man are for the most part

* Part i. ch. 3.

† Lucan, '*Pharsalia*,' lib. ix. v. 578.

‡ '*Leviathan*,' part iii.

ridiculous to another.* We are also informed that 'no revealed law is necessary for human happiness, or it would have been made known to the whole race of mankind.' Again, 'fear of power invisible, feigned by the mind or imagined from tales publicly allowed, is religion, not allowed superstition.'† Hobbes, in speaking of impostures wrought by confederacy, has even helped Hume to one of his arguments against Christian miracles. 'Two men conspiring, one to seem lame and the other to cure him, may deceive many; but if these can bring several others to bear witness, they will deceive more.'‡ If Hobbes went to church, Spinoza did the same, and sat out the sermon, a feat his contemporary could not accomplish. If Grote and Austin§ answer for the orthodoxy of Hobbes, who shall answer for the orthodoxy of Grote and Austin? The fact is, the philosophical Radicals fraternize with Hobbes, because they find in his religious notions a common basis for their own agnosticism.

Mob rule in politics, and want of dogmatic fibre in religion, are generally accompanied by grovelling tendencies in philosophy and ethics. Hobbes grounded his motives of right and justice upon utility; the philosophical Radicals do the same. Vice and virtue are only conventional distinctions. Man is not a free agent, though the two Mills advance upon the Hobbesian doctrine by asserting that man, even though the creature of circumstance, has power to modify his own character. There is no fount of morality anterior to positive law. In the absence of spiritual instincts, all the lofty aspirations of man are dissolved into thin air; he becomes a mere animal, with the light of heaven battered out of him. Society deprived of æsthetic culture is reduced to a mere material organization for the supply of man's bodily requirements. This is the golden vista which threatens to supersede the refinements of the present age, when the philosophical Radicals usher us into their new era of civilization. Their adoption of Hobbes sounds a note which ought to direct against them the current of popular antipathy.

In Hobbes's time no question was discussed with greater eagerness than the freedom of the will. The doctrine of Election was maintained at the sword's point. The syllogism of the predestinarian was enforced by military ordinance. The smith discussed it at the forge, the soldier while sharpening his sabre, the courtier over his cards, the huckster in his shop.

* 'Leviathan,' part i. ch. 12. † Ibid. pt. i. ch. 6. ‡ Ibid. pt. iii. ch. 37.
§ 'Province of Jurisprudence determined,' vol. i. p. 252; Grote's *Minor Works*, p. 63.

Even Milton could not describe the rebellious angels without involving them in a debate upon

‘Foreknowledge, will and fate,
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute.’*

The strife between Beza and Arminius upon this subject, at the close of the sixteenth century, involved the Dutch provinces in civic discord. Yet the freedom of the will is an abstract question. Hirsutius Pansa and Cicero in the pleasant woods of Puteoli, as Critias and Socrates on the banks of the Ilissus, discussed it with calm equanimity. Even the Stoics and Epicureans did not allow their differences on this subject to ruffle the serenity of their intercourse. But the moderns could not revive the discussion without smashing each other's houses, and breaking each other's heads. The followers of Calvin hunted their opponents out of the walls of their cities. This dispute, after provoking civic broils in France and disorganizing Holland, like some evil spirit came over to this country to blow the flames of discord between Court and Parliament. The Puritans and Presbyterians, who embraced one another as branches of the Elect, regarded Laud and his party with venomous hatred, because, in conformity with the tenets of the early Church, they refused to chain the human to the decrees of the Divine will. It was the feeling that they were the instruments of God's wrath against those who fettered His omnipotence, which nerved the arm of the zealots who struck down the Royal cause on the fields of Naseby† and Marston Moor.‡ After these battles, the Marquis of Newcastle, and Bramhall, bishop of Derry, fled to Paris, where Hobbes had preceded them some years before. At Newcastle's table, Hobbes met Bramhall. ‘Here we are,’ exclaimed the philosopher, ‘driven into exile by Laud's adoption of free will,’ as if that tenet was unknown to the English Church before Arminius had revived the doctrine in Holland. Hobbes was only right so far as Knox had based Presbytery on Calvinistic principles, which the Puritans to a wide extent shared; and the attempt of Charles to force upon Scotland a religion opposed to those principles led to that alliance between the English and Scotch sectaries, which was so destructive to the monarchy. The remark of Hobbes led to a discussion in which the Bishop maintained the freedom of the will against Hobbes, who contended that man's will was the mere puppet of extrinsic necessity. At the invitation of Newcastle, both parties agreed to renew the controversy in writing. In 1646,

* ‘Paradise Lost,’ b. ii., l. 559–60.
Vol. 164.—No. 328.

† June 14, 1645.
2 G

‡ July 1644.
Bramhall

Bramhall sent his views to the Marquis for Hobbes to answer. Hobbes's reply was committed to the same hands, with an urgent request that his necessitarian doctrines should be kept a profound secret. A rejoinder by the Bishop shortly after followed. Hobbes, however, while binding the Marquis and the Bishop to strict secrecy, had himself unwittingly taken steps to blurt his views abroad. He lent the MS. to a Frenchman for the perusal of his friends, among whom was a young Englishman, who was so enamoured with the theory that he took a copy for himself. In 1654, this work, prefaced with a coarse attack upon the clergy, was published, as Hobbes averred, unknown to himself.* Bramhall, indignant that neither his original essay nor rejoinder to the treatise had accompanied the publication, issued in 1655 his 'Defence of True Liberty of Human Actions from Antecedent or Extrinsic Necessity.' To this work Hobbes, by way of reply, published in 1656 his 'Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance.' Bramhall, in 1658, returned to the charge with 'Castigations of Hobbes's "Animadversions" upon True Liberty.' A bulky Appendix was attached to the work, entitled 'The Catching of the Leviathan.' To the 'Castigations' Hobbes gave no heed, but in 1668 he replied to the Appendix, assigning as a reason for his long silence that the Bishop's writings fell so flat upon the public ear, that he himself had only heard a few weeks ago of a work which the Bishop had published ten years before. Bramhall, who had been at the Restoration raised to the Irish Primacy, was not alive to appreciate the compliment. Even Hobbes's reply was not published until he also had been removed from the scene.

The view of Hobbes on human liberty was the natural outcome of his own system of philosophy. If nothing exists but matter and the mechanical forces which govern its evolutions, man's will must be ruled by extrinsic circumstances independent of its control. Liberty, with Hobbes, is mere freedom from external impediment, and men have no greater share of it than other animals. Sensuous appetite and the will are identical both in brute and man. The process of willing in all creatures is simply the balancing of one sensuous inclination against another, with the absolute certainty that the strongest will prevail. Bramhall charged Hobbes with confounding the faculty of the will with the act of volition. But this was hardly correct, for Hobbes denied the existence of the faculty altogether, and limited the sphere of the will to the actual

* Molesworth evidently set down this Preface to Hobbes, for he inserts it in his edition without note or comment.

deliberation between contending inclinations. When the deliberations between alternate appetites end with the passing into act of some inclination, it then becomes will. Will is the last appetite in deliberating, and nothing else is to be called so in common nature. 'If a lashed spinning-top were sensible of its own motions, it would ascribe them to its will unless it felt what lashed it;' so man, impelled by his own selfish interests, thinks his actions proceed from his independent will, and 'seeth not the lashings which cause his will.'* Man's responsibility, therefore, as a moral agent vanishes, and with it goes, in conformity with the Hobbean Ethics, the radical distinction between vice and virtue.

While Hobbes is emphatic in making our volitions the mere creations of appetite, upon the freedom of human action his phraseology is ambiguous. Man, he asserts, though not free to will, is free to act. Yet all actions of free agents are necessary. The will, though involuntary, is the beginning of voluntary actions.† These propositions Bramhall condemned as grossly inconsistent. Indeed Hobbes could only maintain them, as he maintained his geometrical novelties, by using terms in a sense directly opposite to the current meaning. A river, according to him, is free to run down its channel as a stone to fall to the earth, just as man is free to walk or run if there be no external hindrance to motion. But the term 'free' in this sense is entirely out of place; for if any creature, animate or inanimate, is driven into a certain course of action, it matters little, as far as Liberty is concerned, whether the coercive power comes from within or without. Water finds its own level by an inherent force; not because it is free to do so, but because it cannot help doing so. Man, when driven along by the prevailing appetite which Hobbes calls will, is no more free than when impelled by some extrinsic agent to act against his will. This distinction then between freedom from compulsion and freedom from necessity—legitimate enough in itself—only assists Hobbes to hide his fatalism under the mask of liberty. In the one case our consciousness of freedom is a delusion, in the other our consciousness of force is a reality; but in both, every vestige of independent volition is extinguished. That the sensuous appetites of man are constantly combated and controlled by his reason, which the schoolmen call his rational appetite, is one of the commonest facts of the human consciousness. Yet Hobbes declared this controlling power surpassed his understanding: and he could not comprehend that of which he denied the existence.

* Vol. v. p. 55, Molesworth's ed.

† *De Corpore Politico*, vol. iv. p. 122, Molesworth's ed.

In excluding the spiritual forces from the will, Hobbes shut out the cardinal features of the subject, for between those spiritual forces and the animal lies the arena of the struggle in which the human character is determined. We cannot, therefore, endorse Professor Robinson's eulogy on Hobbes for surpassing all who have written on this subject in clearness of conception and statement. The reverse would have been nearer the truth. Indeed in the dispute with Bramhall, he displays the same perversion of terms, the same inaptitude for comprehending the facts of his subject, the same dogmatic assurance, that characterized his subsequent controversy with Wallis.

The salient feature which distinguished Christianity from Paganism is the freedom of the will. The faculty of foreknowledge ascribed to human agents strengthened the belief, that everything was fixed by the irrevocable decrees of Fate. Even the realist Plato, who differed about most things with the Stoics, agreed with them in this, that vice was involuntary,—that malefactors by the force of circumstances were driven into crime against their inclination.* But Christianity invested man with moral responsibility as a free agent. The sensuality which the pagan deified, the Christian punished with fire from heaven. Sin, instead of being some act to which man was driven by irresistible necessity, consisted in the free adoption by the will of some act repugnant to the Divine law. This cardinal doctrine is maintained by all the Canonical Fathers in whose pages the tenets of the early Church are faithfully reflected. Yet Hobbes maintained that the freedom of the will was absolutely denied by the early Christians. Hobbes carried his predestinarian views so far as to identify the necessity of the Stoic with that of the Christian, though, even in the rigid Calvinistic sense, there is a yawning gulf between them. The heathen fatalist subjected God to destiny; the Christian, destiny to God. The Stoic found himself in front of an irresistible force alien to the will, against which it was useless to struggle. The necessity of the Christian arose from prevenient grace bending man, through the instrumentality of his will, to conform to the behests of God. Even in the case of the reprobate the will concurs with the necessity which hurries the victim to his doom. But there is no such thing as Christian necessity, except in the predestinarian sense. For, according to the more orthodox opinion, man can determine himself in favour of good or

* Plato, 'The Laws,' book ix., 'The Timæus,' 86. Stallbaum. Aristotle and Cicero maintain the opposite view. But they were in advance of their age. 'Nic. Ethics,' book iii., and 'De Fato.'

evil, though only with the assistance of grace can he accomplish the good. It suited, however, Hobbes's purpose to propitiate the dominant religious faction, by clothing his fatalism with a Christian dress, and by making the Apostles sponsors for the opinions of Beza and Calvin. Even Luther and Melancthon are cited by Hobbes as patrons of the same doctrine, though Luther and Melancthon, after coquetting with it for a time, repudiated the doctrine altogether. The bands and gown of the Reformers were so well assumed by Hobbes, that the travesty has even imposed upon Professor Robertson himself. 'The psychological consideration' (of the will) says the Professor, 'tends to separate Hobbes from the fatalists and the theological predestinarians, with whom he does not hesitate to speak' (to identify himself). But it seems incongruous to speak of anything so slender as psychological analysis separating two systems as wide apart as matter and spirit; for the fatalism of Hobbes differs as much from the necessity of the Calvinists, as the blind impulse of mechanical force differs from the spiritual powers which, in conformity with the decrees of God, make man's will the instrument of his salvation or perdition. Empedocles disguised as Zwinglius could not be more ludicrous than Hobbes in the garb of Calvin or Hugh Peters. The doctrine of mechanical necessity, tricked out in a Christian dress, saved Hobbes from the fangs of proscription. But this immunity was dearly purchased at the sacrifice of consistency. Spinoza, who denied human liberty on the same grounds as Hobbes, having no motive for travestying his views, exposed them in all their naked repulsiveness to his contemporaries. But the atmosphere of Amsterdam was not that of London. Hobbes, rather than incur the ban of the Censorship, spoke the language of popular prejudice. By the admission of contradictory principles, for the sake of a little temporary repose, he distorted for all time the features of his philosophy.

The overthrow of the old theology and the philosophy of Aristotle, in the sixteenth century, cleared the ground for the erection of new systems. The work of the Reformers was negative. They had demolished everything, without even laying the foundations of a new edifice. Descartes' work on method (1637) was the first contribution to that end. When Hobbes entered the field about this juncture, he was impelled by the blankness of the prospect to build up the whole code of morals and divinity, of mental and physical philosophy, on new foundations. The Church had drawn its ethics from Divine sanctions; Aristotle, from the conventions of society; but Hobbes founded his moral code on the primitive instincts of savage man. The
natural

natural state of man being that of a predatory beast, the whole category of human virtues was ascribed to selfishness. Individual greed, the dread of losing the fruits of our rapacity, was, according to Hobbes, the foundation of the most chivalrous impulse of the human breast. 'Good and evil are mere names for our appetites and aversions.'* Conscience was opinion.† Modesty was habit. Pity, a fiction of future calamity to ourselves.‡ The conservation of life, and the acquisition of gain, were the two roots from which sprang all the spiritual instincts of human nature. No sooner had Hobbes laid down these principles in his 'De Cive' and in his treatise on Human Nature, than Rochefoucauld worked them out in his maxims, and embodied them in practice by his seduction of the celebrated Longueville.

Men have generally traced their lineage to the skies. Legendary history holds up to him the mirror of Divine descent. *A Jove principium* is the motto on every national scutcheon. The most consistent and comprehensive philosophies have bound men together by the same chain which attaches them to the Divinity. Man's duties to himself, as well as his duties to his neighbours and his duties to the State, receive their final sanction and most important guarantee from his duties to his Creator. Hobbes, by wiping out the Creator and substituting the State in his place, inverted the synthesis, and involved himself in endless follies and contradictions. According to him, 'The passions of men are in themselves no sin. No more are the actions which proceed from those passions, till men know a law that forbids them; which till laws be made they cannot know; nor can any law be made, till they have agreed upon the person that shall make it.'§ Any one, therefore, was justified in cheating or killing his neighbour, if the State issued no command to the contrary, or if the act was committed in the absence of State authority. It was the very essence of the old theology that law was coeval with creation. This was the golden chain of which Homer speaks as binding the earth to Olympus.¶ But Hobbes contended that as man had no superior but the State, Law could not exist before the State was constituted to impose it. Whatever the sovereign decreed was right, whatever he forbade was unlawful.¶ Hence Nero when he slew his mother, or Gloucester when he murdered his nephews, or David when he compassed the death of Uriah, was

* 'Leviathan,' part i. ch. 15.

† 'Hum. Nature,' ch. ix. § 20.

‡ 'Iliad,' b. viii. 19, 25.

† 'De Corp. Pol.' pt. ii. ch. 6, § 12.

§ 'Leviathan,' pt. i. ch. 13.

¶ 'De Cive,' ch. 14, § 17; ch. 12, § 1.

guilty

guilty of no crime, and committed no injustice.* It is sin in a subject to worship God, except in conformity with the religion which the sovereign has imposed.† It mattered little to Hobbes that states maintained conflicting religions and opposite measures of justice. Truth with him varied with every degree of latitude. Virtue and vice were mere creatures of time and place. It was in the highest degree criminal in a subject to arrogate to himself the power of distinguishing between right and wrong. This was the exclusive prerogative of the Sovereign. Hobbes himself was a rebel when he wrote his books for this purpose, and licensed them at the Oxford University as the oracle of sound morals.‡

The eternal and immutable principles of morality anterior to human law, and imparting to it much of its binding force and efficacy, Hobbes resolutely banished from his system. He even censures Coke for making *Jus* correlative with Law—the right which the Law must confirm, as belonging to each by virtue of Justice.§ *Jus* in its proper sense is the foundation of *Lex*, but Hobbes placed the terms as wide apart as ‘Restraint and Liberty.’|| *Jus* is the unbounded licence man enjoyed in a state of nature; *Lex* the fetter imposed upon him in society. The laws of Nature as expounded by Hobbes are certain maxims, in the main egoistic, framed by man’s reason to secure his safety and happiness.¶ These laws of Nature, and the Divine law, are perfectly identical.** Hobbes must have been singularly impervious to the sense of contradiction, for in his state of nature ‘Force and Fraud are the cardinal virtues. The notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice, have there no place; since these qualities relate to men in society, not in solitude. Where there is no human power there is no law; where no law, no injustice.’†† The laws of Nature, in other words the Divine law, spring from the reason, and have no other object than the convenience and utility of civilized man. When legists speak of human law as having no binding force in conflict with the Divine law, they spoke a language which Hobbes could not understand, for to him the Divine law had no existence unless enforced by the civil authority. Antigone, appealing to the eternal and inviolable laws of the gods against Creon’s enactment forbidding her to bury

* ‘Leviathan,’ part ii. ch. 21.

† ‘De Cive,’ ch. 15, § 9.

‡ ‘Leviathan,’ part ii. ch. 27.

§ ‘Dialogues on the Common Law.’

|| ‘Leviathan,’ part i. ch. 14; and ‘De Corpore Politico,’ part i. ch. 1, § 6.

¶ Ibid., where they are set out *in extenso*; and also in ‘De Cive,’ chs. 2 and 3. In part iii. ch. 42 of ‘Leviathan’ he includes among them one half of the Decalogue.

** ‘De Corpore Politico,’ part ii. ch. 18, § 7.

†† Ibid. part i. ch. 13.

her brother, would be to Hobbes a meaningless spectacle, as he knew of no law except that formulated by the chief of the State. The principles of eternal justice have their seat in a personal Deity, but as a personal Deity found no place in Hobbes's system, he recognized no justice higher than the decree of man. But the heathen might have taught Hobbes a superior lesson. 'In the reign of Tarquin,' says Cicero, 'there was no law promulgated against adultery. When, therefore, Sextus Tarquin violated Lucretia, it did not follow that he did not offend against the Eternal Law. For he had the sense of moral obligation within him, which does not begin to be a law for the first time when it is drawn up in writing, but from the very moment when it exists, and this existence is coeternal with the Divine mind itself.' *

The fallacy underlying the whole foundation of Hobbes's moral system is broadly stated in the introduction to the 'Leviathan.' 'Know thyself,' says Hobbes, 'for whoever looketh into himself and considereth what he does, when he opines, reasons, hopes, fears, and upon what grounds; he shall thereby read and know what are the thoughts of all other men upon the like occasions.' This is to say, in other words, we must take our own insulated feelings and experience as the common test of those of humanity. Hobbes was naturally born a coward. He feared death as a sort of self-annihilation. All men, therefore, are cowards, and fear death much in the same manner. It did not occur to Hobbes that the feelings of men towards the same objects are as various as their complexions under the same sun. Some men meet death with rapture, others shrink from it with terror. Some are brave and noble by instinct, others cowardly and grovelling by fear. Hobbes seems to have gone in for the doctrine of Averroës, that one universal soul was diffused throughout the whole race of man. But he left out of the account the constitutional differences, the diverse organisms, which, as Averroës maintained, make one man an angel and another a brute. Even Hobbes himself was a remarkable instance of peculiar temperament arising out of causes anterior to his birth. His mother, during pregnancy, was frightened into a swoon by a false alarm of the landing of the Spanish Armadists. The shock turned Hobbes's brain into a vehicle of imaginary terrors. He fled from England in 1640, and from France in 1651, haunted by the pursuit of his own shadow. Even in the peaceful bosom of the Devonshire family he fancied traitors lurked, to surrender him to prosecutors who

* 'De Legibus,' ii. 4, § 10.

had no existence. The very mention of death alarmed him. To take his own isolated fears as the measure of the fears of everybody else, to construct out of his own feelings the motives which governed the whole human family, was the fallacy upon which Hobbes reared the whole edifice of cynicism. To make the feelings of the individual the test for all mankind was a mistake wide enough in itself. But Hobbes went further. He took the feelings of the worst as the criterion of the feelings of the best men, and drew up a universal indictment against his species.

Hobbes had some acquaintance with Bacon. But it is a peculiar feature of his character that, while seeking to trace all our spiritual ideas, all the garniture of our minds to mere sensation and experience, he should have discarded the inductive process which is the only method of turning that experience to any account. No one was more hostile to the *à priori* assumptions of Aristotle than Hobbes, yet he not only adopted but relied exclusively upon the deductive process, the great instrument which Aristotle used for scattering his errors through the world. Hobbes, therefore, sedulously worked to little purpose, because he worked with wrong tools. By applying to the development of empirical doctrines the method adapted solely to the principle of innate ideas, Hobbes's mental researches were so obscured by foreign alloy that the fruit was appropriated by others; while in the field of physical science, this rejection of the inductive process stultified his efforts altogether. Hobbes censured the Royal Society for neglecting general principles and accumulating minute experiments; since if this system is to prevail, philosophy would no longer be the appanage of cultivated men, but of gardeners, perfumers, and apothecaries. Hobbes, therefore, in accordance with these views, set out on his physical enquiries, in his usual manner, by laying down universal propositions. Two bodies cannot occupy the same space. No body put in motion can stop, and no body at rest can be put in motion, without the action of some extraneous cause. From nothing, nothing can proceed. No body can become greater or smaller without adding to or subtracting from its substance. With these and similar propositions as axioms and postulates, Hobbes proceeds to discuss the question whether there is a *plenum* or a *vacuum*, and decides in favour of the former. Unless the whole universe was pervaded by air, there could be no winds, which are caused by bodies changing their places and so disturbing the atmospheric equilibrium. For as two bodies cannot both occupy the same place, the air forced out of its original position rushes back to occupy the place which the disturbing body had
just

just left.* Very high winds cause frost and ice. This Hobbes assigned as a reason why wells are never known to freeze. They lie too deep in the earth for the winds to get at them. Winds are constantly generated in the sky by the rapid flight of clouds; but when these slacken speed, or come under the influence of the sun, or are imprisoned in space too small for their bulk, the ice breaks and out leaps the thunder.† Lightning is only caused by the recoil of the air against the eye. It, in consequence, has no burning qualities; but, contrariwise, strikes men dead with cold.‡

The mechanism of nature was resolvable into motion as that of society into the unfettered liberty of man. The sun was a sort of stationary mainspring, constantly throwing off ether in circular currents. The rotating circles thus created whirled the planets along their orbits. The displacement of the air caused by bodies, when thrown upwards, in conjunction with the current caused by the earth's motion, is the reason of their descent to the earth. The air rushes downward to fill the place vacated by the upward body, and by so doing stops the descent of the upward body and hurries it back to the earth. Gravity, Hobbes discarded as an unknown agent, which explained nothing.§ The tides are caused by the earth's diurnal motion, the waters rushing, as the earth turns round its axis, to the high shores of America and India, and back again twice every twenty-four hours. The high and neap tides were produced by the moon's revolution, which pressed the air down upon the waters with more force upon some occasions than others.|| After throwing similar light upon other natural phenomena, Hobbes winds up with congratulating his readers and himself upon having initiated them into the mysteries of the universe, without the use of sympathy, antipathy, antiperistasis, or any other of those empty terms which Plato, Seneca, and Aristotle, were so fond of introducing as the key to the explanation of the secrets of nature. In this feeling of exultation, Hobbes was hardly consistent, for he had adopted Kepler's notion, that the earth's eccentricity was caused by the waters of the South and Indian Seas having a stronger sympathy for the sun than the dry land of the opposite hemisphere. That part of the earth, in consequence, is drawn a little nearer to the sun, and makes the sun's perigæum occur always in the winter solstice. It is singular to find a philosopher who was so fond of prying into the mysteries of nature, when he came to the

* *Physica*, ch. 26, § 3 and 4.

† *Ibid.* ch. 28, § 14.

‡ *Ibid.* ch. 8, § 6 and 7.

§ *Ibid.* ch. 30, § 4.

|| *Ibid.* ch. 26, § 8.

may
solv
con
The
assi
and
him
caus
com
bey
deal
have
the
B
deve
to h
he v
the
Euch
wron
of s
road
with
poin
out.
Hob
the
all k
ticab
Oxf
Wall
whos
Univ
there
his tr
tear
matie
was
unbor
befor
own
Wall
was t
after
every

magnitude of the earth, confess that the problem so easily solved by the ancients, was above human ken, and ought to be consigned to those who had charge of the mysteries of religion. The whole thing reads like a travesty of Swift. Hobbes, after assigning ridiculous reasons for a world of abstruse phenomena, and introducing terms for the explanation of things, flatters himself he is not like other men, who, instead of unfolding the causes of things, feed their readers with verbiage; but when he comes to the simplest question of physics, avouches it to be beyond the grasp of human intelligence, and only fit to be dealt with by the hierophants of the Deity. Hobbes could not have expounded physics in more grotesque fashion, had he been the Rabelais of his epoch.

But it was in the field of mathematics that Hobbes's blunders developed into the most startling absurdities. In proportion to his ignorance of the subject was his personal conceit, that he was competent to instruct the most proficient masters of the science. It was not till his fortieth year that he opened Euclid, when he discovered that the leading definitions were wrong, and that the whole structure of geometry had need of serious alterations. A straight line might be the shortest road between two points; but how a straight line could be without breadth, or any superficies without thickness, or any point without magnitude, Hobbes could not in the least make out. These definitions were absurd on the very face of them. Hobbes, therefore, having corrected Euclid, set about squaring the circle, doubling the cube, cubing the sphere, and solving all kinds of problems which had been hitherto deemed impracticable. There were in those days (1654-55) two Professors at Oxford; Seth Ward, of Astronomy, and the more celebrated Wallis, who held the Savilian Chair of Geometry. Hobbes, whose fame was steadily rising in the world, had assailed the Universities for not encouraging scientific investigations. He, therefore, sharpened the ire of these professors, who, as soon as his treatise '*De Corpore*' appeared, readily embraced the task of tearing it to pieces. Ward took the physics, Wallis the mathematical portion of the treatise. The exposure of Hobbes's errors was the more decisive as his adversaries had obtained an unbound volume of the '*De Corpore*,' in which Hobbes had, before revision of the last proofs, endeavoured to amend his own demonstrations. The mutilations in the text enabled Wallis to follow Hobbes's blunders step by step. The result was the '*Elenchus Geometriæ Hobbianæ*,' which, three months after the '*De Corpore*' appeared, completely smashed to atoms every proposition which Hobbes had advanced on the subject.

But

But Hobbes was far from yielding to the enemy. He had, indeed, removed the more serious portion of his mistakes before issuing an English translation of the 'De Corpore' in 1556. But he, nevertheless, maintained the accuracy of the portions he had himself abandoned, and sought to carry the war into the enemy's quarters by attacking Wallis's 'Arithmetic of Infinites.' The result was still more mistakes and absurdities. Hobbes could lay bare, as with a scalping knife, the most complex psychological phenomena; but he was unable to grasp the commonest mathematical abstraction. His mind was too hardened, his ideas too crystallized to be permeated by the new analysis. He could understand infinites neither *à parte ante* nor *à parte post*. He could not conceive a series of quantities infinitely increasing or decreasing within prescribed limits. He could not, for the life of him, comprehend how one line could approach another perpetually, and yet never touch. What Hobbes could not understand, he pronounced not only impossible but absurd. The doctrine of roots, as applied to linear figures, gravelled him. Hobbes set his face against all square roots which did not terminate in integers. Fractional roots were delusions. He called upon the Royal Society to condemn Wallis for maintaining these innovations, much in the same spirit as Augustine appealed to Rome to condemn Pelagius.

The quadrature of the circle and the duplication of the cube have, from the days of Plato until now, been deemed insoluble by any of the recognized processes of geometry. As Hobbes, however, had a geometry of his own, he found no difficulty in solving these problems off-hand. In duplicating the cube he drew two lines intersecting a third at a single point. It was in vain Wallis pointed out that the intersection did not take place at the given point. Though the lines came very near, they did not exactly touch. But Hobbes contended that a point had magnitude, and made his large enough to fill the requisite space. Wallis pointed out, if a point had magnitude, that a whole line would be less than its two halves. Hobbes maintained that this was considering a point in the abstract, which was a totally different thing from a point used in the solution of mathematical problems. Wallis had shown himself a great pioneer in algebra, which was then receiving large developments from Descartes' recent application of its principles to geometry. His feud with Wallis induced Hobbes to attack the whole doctrine of symbols by which algebraic analysis was carried on. They were to him meaningless scratches, like those of a hen on the sands, or such as a spider, if dipt in ink, would scrawl upon paper.

paper. After abuse of this sort, Hobbes flatters himself he has 'wrested that weapon of algebra out of the hands of the Oxford professors in such a manner that they will never have recourse to it again.' Hobbes, doubtless, thought he had extinguished algebra; that Wallis would become as unknown as the quantities with which he professed to deal, and carry with him functions, bi-quadratics, and converging series into obscurity. But Wallis reserved his wrath till the Restoration, when he impeached Hobbes's loyalty, which opened the mathematical feud again. Hobbes attacked Wallis under the name of Henry Stubbe and other assumed patronymics. He even got papers published in Paris to show that the French savans had adopted his views against the Savilian professor, with the expectation of inducing his countrymen to believe that abroad he was regarded victor in the contest. But Wallis maintained a dignified silence. It was useless to contend with an adversary who could not comprehend the most rudimentary principles of a science of which he affected to be master. At length, after fourscore years had benumbed the ardour of Hobbes, the controversy drew to a close. Hobbes, in 1672, published what he called '*Lux Mathematica*,' in which he fired a parting shot at his antagonist, whom he foolishly imagined he had silenced. Two years previous he had collected into one volume his quadrature of the circle, cubation of the sphere, and duplication of the cube. That such a triumph of genius might be ushered into the world with becoming pomp, he dedicated the work to his old patron, the Grand Duke of Florence.

Hobbes's metaphysics, if a man who denied spirit can be said to have any metaphysics, were sharp and decisive. Like Aristotle, he confounds philosophy with science, and opposes both to experience. By experience we gain a knowledge of things; by philosophy or science, a knowledge of causes. Yet of first principles we know nothing. All science with Hobbes resolves itself into a knowledge of consequences. There is no absolute knowledge except that of fact. Hence the whole scientific nomenclature of metaphysics became inverted, if it can be said for Hobbes to have had any existence. The absolute arose out of the contingent. Every scientific fact was relative. We can only trace back the causes of phenomena, a few links in the chain of antecedents and consequents, when knowledge became only an assumed word for enlightened ignorance. In these views there was much truth mixed with a large alloy of error. While restricting science to the appearances of things, Hobbes overlooked the causes of those appearances, which are the province of philosophy. All science appeared

appeared to him to involve homogeneous principles, to be explored by one uniform method. He failed to seize the distinction between the absolute and the relative, as appertaining to things outside and within the refracting medium of the human organism. The consideration of space and time as the mere functional conditions of human thought would have converted the facts, which he termed absolute, into the most contingent elements of human knowledge. His wide range of thought stands out in bold contrast with his dogmatic exclusiveness. In the map that he constructed of the sciences, though algebra, trigonometry, and conic sections, had received important developments in his day, he banished them from the domain of knowledge. Trigonometry, he strangely alleged, might be utilized in land-surveying, whence it derived its origin, but it was perfectly useless in astronomy or navigation. The science of quantity, with Hobbes, was strictly limited to geometry and arithmetic. The functional symbols which were destined to revolutionize science, Hobbes regarded as a spectre to be got rid of at once and for ever.

That Hobbes, with such views, should have been appointed mathematical tutor to the Prince of Wales (Charles II.) can be accounted for on no other supposition than that the Court party, during their French exile, were desirous to attach a writer to their interest who had shown great talents, and who, like them, had fled his country because he found existence in it no longer supportable. With Hobbes the post was only a sort of sinecure, created at his own request, as he was vain of his proficiency in a branch of science of which he knew little, and that little very inaccurately. Charles, however, quitted Paris for Holland in 1648, and Hobbes, utterly indifferent to the cause of his royal pupil, seems to have had no hesitation in launching the 'Leviathan' upon the world. In executing this work, Hobbes, by blending Puritan doctrines with his political theories, was anxious to prepare the way for his favourable reception at home. The 'Leviathan' is the 'Citizen' in an evangelical dress. The compact between despotism and organized democracy appears to have afforded Hobbes an opportunity of reconciling Fatalism with Judaic Christianity, and Materialism with belief in the Divine inspiration of Scripture. The image before which Hobbes bent down was Cromwell, who maintained that the five books of Moses contained all the elements of law and equity. But a few years after the worshipper appeared, the idol was smitten by an invisible hand. At the restoration of Charles, however, Hobbes was equal to the situation. The frontispiece to the 'Leviathan,' which originally bore a striking

striking resemblance to Cromwell, was immediately cast aside for one bearing a likeness to the restored King. But the Royalists were not appeased by this duplicity. An enquiry into the doctrines of the 'Leviathan,' with a view to its suppression, found no difficulty in obtaining the sanction of Charles's first Parliament (1666). Hobbes, attacked as an infidel, appealed to the good-humoured King in proof of his orthodoxy, as he had appealed to the Royal Society in proof of the soundness of his mathematics.

His idea of heresy was indeed as absurd as his conception of lightning. As there was no Court of Heresy in England since the High Commission Court was abolished by the Long Parliament, he contended that the 'Leviathan,' which was published after that period, could not be deemed heretical in any sense. The truth or falsity of a creed was to be tested by its agreement with the law of the country in which it was promulgated, and not by its conformity with Divine revelation. Milton held aloof from all places of public worship; Hobbes most sedulously attended the services of the English Church. He, therefore, could point to his practice, and it was easy for him to adduce passages from the 'Leviathan' to prove that his practice conformed to his theory. The King, however, did not interfere except to protect the philosopher from persecution. Hobbes was permitted to pass his days quietly in London, or in Derbyshire with the Devonshire family, who, as they had sheltered his youth, flung the shield of their protection over his old age. He felt, however, that his scheme of philosophy was played out. There was as little room for free thought in England under the Restoration as under the Commonwealth. But the literary activity of Hobbes, dammed up in one quarter, broke out in another. He dedicated the closing years of his life (1674-5) to the translation of the 'Iliad' and the 'Odyssey,' and survived the undertaking. As a rendering of the spirit and vigour of the original, Hobbes's version is far below Chapman's, and cannot bear even a remote comparison with that of Cowper. Homer, stripped of his figures and similes, is reduced to two-thirds of his Greek dimensions. To Hobbes's generation the work may have been an agreeable surprise. To us, it bears the same relation to Chapman's or Pope's, as a Virgin of Cimabue to the Divine Madonnas of Raphael. Hobbes showed the weakness of his poetic insight by his absurd praise of Gondebert.* He could have little perception of the marvellous beauties of the original, when he placed Davenant above Homer.

* 'Letters on the nature and conditions of Heroic Poetry.'

The fact is, Hobbes was eminently disqualified for the task by nature and experience. He was a materialist, the disperser of every illusion which the feelings impose upon the intellect. In mental analysis, in carrying the torch of enquiry into the darkest recesses of the human mind, in unravelling the complex skein of human motives, Hobbes probably had no equal. His version of 'Thucydides' is, therefore, read with profit and enjoyment, while few open his 'Homer' except to gratify literary curiosity.

Hobbes's doctrines, reasoned out to their legitimate results, would have led him to the revolutionary code of civil rights, and the enthronement of reason as the goddess of humanity. But he stopped midway, because his age presented barriers to free-thought dangerous to overleap. Had it not been for Cromwell, the 'Leviathan' would never have been written. Had it not been for the reactionary spirit of Charles's Parliament, Hobbes would probably have passed his decline in harmonizing the discordant parts of his own system, instead of travestying the thoughts of others. He passed much of his time abroad. French and Italian were as familiar to him as his mother tongue. But he had not, like Descartes, Rousseau, or Voltaire, the slender courage to seek refuge in Holland or Switzerland in order to launch with safety his thunderbolts round Europe. He paid the penalty, therefore, in wasting his life upon a hybrid system of philosophy which neither pleased kings nor opened the understanding of the people, because it was subversive of the interests of both. His ethics have as strong a tendency to corrupt morals as his politics to destroy liberty. But the efforts of Hobbes set men thinking. He had upturned the clod, leaving it for others to reap the harvest. Locke appropriated his law of the association of ideas, and embodied his fragmentary discourses on the intellectual powers in his great work on the human understanding. In the next century, Hobbes's ethics and citizenship culminated in Helvetianism and the revolutionary code of the Convention. But in the progress of human thought, Hobbes's name is engraven on no edifice, nor identified with the triumph of any great principle. With all his industry and talent, through his disposition to flatter those in authority, and his overweening care of his own safety, he merely enabled others to extract fame out of his obscurity, and with the fragments of his system to build up a reputation which belonged to himself.

ART. VI.—1. *Agricultural Returns of Great Britain for 1886.* London. 1886.

2. *Statistical Abstract for the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom.* London, 1885.

3. *Report of the American Department of Agriculture for 1885.* Washington: Government Printing Office. 1886.

4. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1885.* Washington: Government Printing Office. 1886.

5. *Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada, 1885.* Ottawa. 1886.

6. *Statistical Abstract for Canada, 1886.*

7. *Crop Bulletins for Manitoba, 1886.* Winnipeg: Department of Agriculture. 1886.

8. *Official Reports of the Government of India. 1884 to 1886.*

GROWING wheat at a loss is an operation that cannot be persisted in for a long period on an extensive scale; and it is not surprising that, after three years of unremunerative prices, many British farmers are disposed to regard their struggle with foreign and colonial competitors as almost hopeless. That few farmers in the United Kingdom have been able to grow wheat without loss during the last three years, is generally admitted. Indeed, when the high rents and other expenses of years further back are considered, it is not too much to say, that wheat-growing has failed to yield a living profit in this country for the ten years ending with 1886. Any one doubting this statement has only to look at the figures in the *Agricultural Returns*—bearing in mind the fondness of farmers for wheat, as a ready-money crop, and as almost indispensable on account of the usefulness of its straw—and he will doubt no longer. Since 1876 the area of the wheat crop of the United Kingdom has decreased by 767,448 acres, or by nearly 25 per cent.; and this was not because other corn crops paid well, for the net decrease in the area under all kinds of corn during the period has been 1,196,059 acres, which quantity has been absorbed in the increase of permanent pasture, cultivated grasses, and clover. But rents have gone down greatly since 1876, and farmers have learned how to cut down expenses in many ways, so that if they expected prices to range as they were from 1876 to 1882 inclusive, that is from an annual average price of 44s. 4d. to 56s. 9d. per quarter, wheat would probably be grown now as extensively as it was cultivated ten years ago. Of course, if the average price of wheat were never to be below 40s., it would sometimes be higher, and, supposing it to range from

40s. to 45s., as a general rule, there is reason to believe that our farmers might easily be placed in a position to grow with profit a much larger acreage than they have produced during the last few years. The changes necessary in order to place them in such a position may be briefly stated.

It is obvious that the rents readily paid when the average price of wheat usually ranged above 50s. cannot be expected, if prices are likely to be 20 per cent. lower. When the rents paid by sitting tenants have been brought down to the level of those charged in new lettings, there will not be much cause for complaint on that score. Next, enterprise should be encouraged by allowing fair compensation for all tenants' improvements which add to the value of a holding, and that without the cumbrous and often costly machinery of the Agricultural Holdings Act. Restrictive covenants must be abolished, and farmers must be free, subject to reasonable penalties for deterioration, to crop their land and sell its produce to the best advantage. The right to sell straw often makes all the difference between growing wheat at a profit and growing it at a loss. Wheat-straw in many districts sells at from five to eight times its manurial value; and where that is the case, the folly of insisting on its being all trodden down in yards by live-stock is obvious. Justice from railway companies is another condition essential to farmers. Lastly, such relief from local and imperial taxation as can fairly be allowed to farmers is reasonably to be expected, considering the trying conditions under which they have to carry on their industry. With respect to tithe rent-charge, which many farmers regard as a great grievance, there is reason to expect that the direct payment of it will shortly be demanded from the owners of real property, instead of from tenants, in the first instance. As it is certainly very much to the disadvantage of the country that land should be diverted from arable cultivation to grass, the non-agricultural classes will be wise, even from a selfish point of view, if they not only refrain from opposing, but earnestly help forward, any reasonable reforms or concessions which will give farmers a fair chance of meeting foreign competition.

In proceeding to consider what grounds there are for expecting that, under fair conditions, wheat in the future may be profitably produced in this country, the cost of growing the crop is, of course, the first point to be dealt with. Now, the circumstances of farming, under the general heads of expenses and returns, vary so greatly, even in our own country, that it is impossible to state with precision what is the minimum or the average cost of producing an acre of wheat. Indeed, it is not

too much to say, that very few farmers know what it separately costs them to grow wheat. This is not so surprising as outsiders might deem it, as it is by no means easy to calculate the cost of one crop out of a series. Again, it is difficult to apportion the miscellaneous expenses of a farm, which cannot be charged to any particular crop or even field. Yet, if certain rules of valuation were uniformly followed, estimates close enough for their purpose might be made. An effort to obtain such estimates from growers of wheat in all the principal producing districts of England was made by the 'Mark Lane Express' in 1885; and the returns collected were published in that journal. Although, unfortunately, many of the contributors failed to follow the directions intended to secure uniformity of method, there is safety in numbers, and it may perhaps be assumed that the errors were mutually corrective to a great extent. At any rate, the returns are the most complete of their kind ever collected, and it is worth while to give them some consideration.

For all England the average expense of producing the wheat crop came out at 8*l.* 0*s.* 7*d.* an acre, and the average returns at 8*l.* 2*s.* 7*d.*, wheat being uniformly valued at 36*s.* a quarter. There was thus an average profit of 2*s.* an acre; but no interest on capital was charged, and comparatively few returns showed any profit, except when straw was sold. It is also to be observed that, out of 200 returns, only a dozen put the rent at less than 1*l.* an acre, although thirty-seven out of the forty English counties were represented. Several charged for rent over 2*l.* an acre, and some much higher amounts. If similar returns were collected now, rents would undoubtedly come out lower, and if wheat-growing is to pay in England, the average rent should be below, rather than above, 1*l.* per acre. Tithe rent-charge varied from a few pence to 10*s.* an acre, the average being a little over 4*s.* Rates and taxes ranged in amount from 1*s.* 2*d.* to 11*s.* in extreme instances. The cost of manuring was most commonly put at 2*l.* to 3*l.* an acre. Now, the higher of these amounts is not enough to charge for farmyard-manure, if the selling value of the straw used in making it be charged; but then a large proportion of the correspondents could not sell straw, their agreements forbidding the sale, and in their case it was proper to charge only consuming value. Besides, the whole value of a good dressing of farmyard-manure ought not to be charged to the crop to which it is applied. In this connection it may be mentioned that wheat has been grown continuously for several years on certain plots at Woburn, under the management of the Royal Agricultural Society, at a cost of less than 2*l.* per acre for manure, yielding, on an average, during the last five years,

2 H 2

30·9 bushels

30·9 bushels per acre, which is 2 bushels above the 'ordinary average' yield for England, according to the Agricultural Department. Under a system of rotation of crops, land less fertile than that at Woburn, if kept as free from weeds, would yield as well with the same manuring.

In order to afford some idea of the general run of the estimates, we give the average expenses, under general heads, as returned by eighty-five growers, living in eleven of the principal wheat-producing counties—Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Cambridgeshire, Kent, Berkshire, Surrey, Sussex, and Hampshire:—

			£	s.	d.
Rent and tithes	1 15	7
Rates and taxes	0 5	0
Manure	2 12	6
Seed, cultivation, &c.	3 17	8
Total expenses per acre	£8 10	9

It will be seen that the expenses in these counties were higher than the average for England as a whole. The receipts were also a little over average, but not sufficiently above to prevent loss, as shown below:—

				£	s.	d.
Grain	6 16	0
Straw	1 12	0
Total receipts per acre	£8 8	0

The last item in the expenses, it may be explained, includes the cost of ploughing, drilling, harrowing, hoeing, harvesting, thatching, threshing, dressing, and marketing. The rent was far too high for the circumstances of farming, and straw, in most cases, must have been consumed on the farms. The average yield was 30½ bushels an acre. At 40s. a quarter this would have turned the loss of 2s. 9d. an acre into a profit of 12s. 3d., from which, however, interest on capital ought to be deducted, as it is not charged in the expenses.

It is worthy of notice that nearly all the contributors to the returns who showed a profit of over 1l. an acre—and several showed a profit of 2l. to 3l.—were allowed to sell straw, and charged it at selling price on the credit side of their balance-sheets. In several instances straw was valued at 3l. 10s. to 4l. 10s. per acre, and in two or three at over 5l., or about three-fourths as much as the value of the grain. The liberty to sell straw, therefore, is an important element in the question of the ability of British farmers to meet foreign competition in the production

of

of wheat. Unfortunately the rail rates for straw are, as a rule, so enormous, that if it is worth only 30s. a ton in the Eastern Counties, and sells at 4l. or more in the Potteries, the rail expenses are too heavy to allow of its being sent to the dearer market. This is one of the numerous examples of the repression of agricultural enterprise by railway companies' extortions. As a rule, it does not pay farmers who are distant from a large town to sell straw, unless they have water-carriage.

In his evidence given before the Royal Commission on Depression of Trade and Agriculture, Sir James Caird expressed the opinion that 'good wheat land, when the rent is re-arranged, will continue to be cultivated even at 36s. a quarter' as the price of wheat. 'The straw,' he added, 'is of considerable value in many parts of the country,' and the possibility of selling it at a good price evidently entered into his calculations. Now 36s. a quarter was the price taken for the valuation of the grain in the returns above referred to, although it was above the average market price which was then or has been since generally current; and it has already been stated that several correspondents showed a satisfactory profit through the sale of straw. But at 36s. only the best of the wheat lands would pay a living profit, and the wheat area will certainly continue to decrease in this country unless we have a higher quotation for the grain. Even with reduced rents it is doubtful whether wheat can be grown in this country at much if any less than 8l. an acre, including interest on capital and other charges apt to be lost sight of in drawing up a balance-sheet. Any farmer who keeps strict accounts knows that there are heavy expenses on a farm which cannot be charged to any particular crop, such as repairs, the cost of a hackney, the wages of a groom and foreman, insurance, the farmer's expenses in going to market, and various other items, which amount altogether to a considerable sum in a year. Scarcely any of the correspondents appear to have charged enough for their wheat crop's share in these miscellaneous expenses. Then, in charging the rent, it is not enough to debit the average rent per acre of the whole farm, outside measurement, to the wheat crop, which is grown on the best of the land. It is usual to reckon on 10 per cent. of loss on the landlord's measurement in roads, fences, yards, and waste, and often there is, besides, more or less land that is a 'make-weight' to the farm, not paying for the average rent. To get at the real rent of the working and paying acreage, then, it is necessary to divide the gross rent by the number of acres which can be relied upon to pay the rent. Suppose, for instance, that a farm of 250 acres is let at 250l. per annum. It will usually

usually be necessary to deduct 25 acres, leaving 225, and charging these with a rent of 1*l.* 2*s.* instead of 1*l.* an acre.

The 'ordinary average' yield of the wheat crop in England is nearly 29 bushels an acre, which, at 36*s.* a quarter (4*s.* 6*d.* a bushel), would return 6*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* If we allow 2*l.* an acre for straw, the total amounts to 8*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.*, leaving a profit of only 10*s.* 6*d.* if the expenses are 8*l.* That is certainly not a 'living profit.' Bearing in mind the fact, that crops fed on the land or in the yards, as a rule, do not yield any profit beyond the manure left by the animals which have consumed them, it is not extravagant to name 2*l.* an acre as a minimum satisfactory margin for interest and profit on the wheat crop, at any rate when straw as well as grain is sold off the land. To obtain that, the price of the grain must be 45*s.* a quarter. But the existing area of wheat, and perhaps a small extension, would be grown at half this satisfactory profit, which could be obtained, according to the estimates, with wheat at 40*s.* Indeed, it is possible to conceive of such reduction in rents, local burdens, rail rates, and other expenses as to render the production of wheat at 40*s.* fairly remunerative. On the whole, then, it appears that, even under such improved conditions for farmers as have been enumerated above, there is no reason to expect the restoration of the wheat acreage of 1876, and still less that of 1866, with any lower range of prices for wheat than that already given—40*s.* to 45*s.* a quarter.

No doubt many readers will be disposed to regard this statement as a verdict of extinction for wheat-growing in England. But it is the object of this article to show, that the foreign wheat supply is not likely to be kept up at a lower range of prices than 40*s.* to 45*s.* a quarter, which, as we have said, will possibly be a remunerative rate for home-grown wheat. Recently, during the period of our vanishing wheat acreage, imports of wheat have increased so enormously, in spite of falling prices during a portion of the period, that people are apt to think that we can obtain all we require at almost any abatement of price. This glut of the market is, however, only temporary and accidental. In 1866-7 our imports of wheat and flour, less exports, were equal to only 7,600,000 quarters of wheat, and it was not till after 1872 that we began to receive over ten million quarters. In 1882-3 the quantity was 19,953,000 qrs.; in the following year, 15,816,000 qrs.; in 1884-5, 18,001,000 qrs.; and in 1885-6, 15,209,515 qrs. The last three quantities have been obtained with wheat at a much lower average price than 40*s.* a quarter, the average for the calendar year 1884 being 35*s.* 8*d.*, while that for 1885 was 32*s.* 10*d.*,

32s. 10d., and that for 1886 was 31s. But it does not follow that wheat will continue to come to us in large quantities at such miserably low prices. Our contention is, that this foreign wheat, with the possible exception of that sent from India, has been supplied at a loss to the growers, and that the wheat-growing area of the world has already begun to contract, and will be seriously diminished unless the average price is at least 40s. a quarter in England. In support of this contention there is such a mass of evidence available, that the collector of it is embarrassed by its volume.

The wheat acreage of the world had been increasing enormously for several years up to 1880, and, less uniformly, up to 1883. In the ten years ending with 1880, the wheat area of the United States rose from a little under nineteen millions to nearly thirty-eight million acres; a gain of nineteen million acres in one country alone. In Australia, in the ten years ending with 1884, there was an increase of over two million acres of wheat. An official report states that the acreage in Bombay is believed to have been doubled during the last twelve years. The wheat area of all India, including the Native States, was over twenty-seven million acres last harvest, an increase of probably one-fourth of that large acreage since 1874, when India first began to export wheat on an extensive scale. Egypt helped to glut the wheat markets of Europe for several years after 1871; but during the last two years the Egyptian supply has been a mere trifle. Chili, again, made a great advance as a wheat-exporting country in 1872, but has made no further progress. The increased supplies from the countries named have been far more than sufficient to supply the needs of the increased population of Europe. But will these supplies keep up at anything like current prices? Our argument is that they will not, and that they have already begun to fall off.

Our principal sources of wheat and flour supply may be ranked in accordance with the quantities which we received from them respectively in the years 1885 and 1886, including every country which sent us in either year as much as a million hundred-weights. Flour imports, in the following list, are converted into wheat equivalents and added to wheat imports, and the total is computed in quarters of eight bushels. It must be explained that insignificant quantities of flour from certain countries, added for 1885, cannot be added for 1886, because the full details are not yet available. The total quantity to be divided, however, is only 201,894 cwts., some of which came from countries not in the list which follows:—

WHEAT

WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTS.

SOURCE.	1885.	1886.
	qrs.	qrs.
United States	8,985,830	8,991,396
India	2,809,675	2,545,067
Russia	2,788,244	856,177
Australasia	1,256,213	170,469
Germany	865,201	539,763
Austrian Territories	544,251	392,967
Canada, &c.	483,548	935,567
Chili	374,508	392,700
Total from principal sources ..	18,107,270	14,824,106
All other Countries	651,941	369,358
Grand Total	18,759,211	15,193,464

Let us consider, then, the prospects of wheat-growing in each of these exporting countries. Does wheat-growing pay in the United States at current prices, or has it paid at the prices of the last three years? Mr. J. R. Dodge, the Statistician of the American Department of Agriculture, in his Annual Report of 1885, writes:—

‘The value of an acre of wheat averaged only 8·38 dollars on an average yield of 13 bushels last year (1884), the lowest return of which there is any record, and a figure lower than the accredited estimate of the cost of production. It may confidently be assumed, therefore, that there is no profit in wheat-production at present prices. But there is a class of farmers who made a profit on wheat in 1884. Those who secured 25 bushels per acre, or 20, obtained a small profit, provided the cost of fertilizers was not too large an element of it.’

Now, this is said of the greatest total crop of wheat ever produced in the United States, and of a yield per acre in excess of the average, which was only 12·3 bushels per acre for the twenty-four years ending with 1885. And if wheat-growing did not pay generally in 1884, when the average yield was 13 bushels, and the ‘farm value’ 8·38 dollars an acre, according to the Department of Agriculture, much less could it have paid in 1885, when the yield was only 10·4 bushels, and the value 8·02 dollars; and there was no appreciable improvement in 1886, when the yield was estimated officially at 12½ bushels, and the value at 8·49 dollars per acre. As to the comparatively few farmers who grow 20 to 25 bushels an acre of wheat getting a small profit, if they have not spent much in fertilizers, that does not amount to much, as there were farmers in England who made a profit, even in 1886. In considering the question whether wheat-production is likely to be kept up in a country

or

or not, at a given price or range of prices, exceptional instances like those referred to do not weigh at all in the argument. In the year referred to by Mr. Dodge, only Colorado yielded as much on an average as 20 bushels of wheat to the acre, and then only 117,420 acres were produced. One State gave only 5 bushels to the acre, five less than 7 bushels, and eight States in all, under 9 bushels. The loss on the wheat crop in those States—all in the South—must have been very heavy. In an exceptionally prolific year, taking those only which grew over a million acres, California, with over three million acres of wheat, gave an average of 13·2 bushels; Illinois, which ranks next in respect of wheat acreage, 11·6 bushels; Minnesota, 15; Indiana, 12·5; Ohio, 15·3; Iowa, 12·0; Missouri, 11·8; Kansas, 16·5; Nebraska, 14·5; Michigan, 16·5; Dakota, 14·5; Pennsylvania, 13·6; Wisconsin, 14; Tennessee, 7; Kentucky, 10·6. These States contained considerably more than three-fourths of the wheat acreage of the country, or over 32 million acres out of the unusually large acreage of nearly 39½ millions. According to Mr. Dodge, wheat-growing did not pay in any one of these, but only in Colorado, where probably the cost of irrigation ate up all the supposed profit. Only four of these States, it will be noticed, come up to three-fourths of the minimum paying wheat yield. Yet 1884 was an unusually productive year.

It appears to be the opinion of certain writers that American farmers plant wheat without any consideration of price. A glance at the official statistics will suffice to prove that this idea is absurd. The following table shows the acreage, average yield per acre, average price per bushel realized by the farmer, and average value per acre of the produce for each year from 1880 to 1886, inclusive, of the wheat crop of the United States:—

Year.	Area of Wheat Crop.	Average Yield per Acre.	Average Price per Bushel.	Average Value of Produce per Acre.
	Acres.	Bushels.	Cents.	Dollars.
1880	37,986,717	13·1	95·1	12·48
1881	37,709,020	10·1	119·3	12·03
1882	37,067,194	13·6	88·2	11·99
1883	36,455,593	11·6	91·0	10·56
1884	39,473,885	13·0	65·0	8·38
1885	34,189,246	10·4	77·1	8·02
1886	37,000,000	12·4	68·7	8·49

Since 1880 the acreage has decreased, except in 1884, when nearly every acre sown was reaped, owing to the favourable character

character of the winter. In 1885 the area sown was over 38,000,000 acres; but about 4,000,000 acres had to be ploughed up, chiefly on account of 'winter-killing.' For 1886 the area harvested was 37,000,000 acres, very little having been ploughed up.

The wheat acreage of the United States, then, has been reduced since 1880, in spite of the increase in the newly-settled land of the North-Western States. It may be said that wheat is the only crop to be grown on land broken up from the prairie, and it is quite clear that, but for the new land, the wheat acreage would have shown a great decrease since 1880. Indeed, the winter wheat area sown fell from 27,450,000 acres in 1881, to 25,265,297 acres in 1886; while spring wheat, grown chiefly in the North-Western States, where the new land has been cultivated, increased from 10,259,000 acres to 12,037,000 acres. But for the newly settled land, then, the wheat acreage would have decreased by at least 2,000,000 acres, and in all probability by a much larger area, as the quantity named is much less than that of the land broken since 1881.

It is not surprising that an average gross return of about 33s. an acre, obtained in 1884 and 1885, did not prove satisfactory to the American wheat-grower. Out of that return there is the expense of carting the wheat, often for a great distance, to a railway or the nearest elevator. The straw is burnt in most parts of America, and where it is not, the expense of growing wheat is increased by the labour of manuring the land. If the gross return were all profit, the wheat-grower would not become rich very rapidly, and 33s. an acre would be only a very moderate profit for a year's labour. The most common size of a farm in America is 80 or 160 acres, and of course not nearly all the land is cropped with wheat in the same year, some of it usually lying fallow. It is a startling fact, that the gross returns of a farmer, getting the average yield from 50 acres of wheat during the last three years, have been less than the earnings of a farm-labourer in many States.

We have seen that, in the opinion of the Statistician of the Department of Agriculture, only those farmers who have grown twenty bushels an acre or more have obtained any profit in recent years. If all the rest ceased to grow wheat, America would become an importing country; and even if the result of a continuance of present prices* were only to cause the cessation of wheat-growing on all land which does not produce the

* Whenever in this article 'present prices' are mentioned, prices in March of the current year are referred to.

present average yield, America would not produce enough to feed her own population.

During the decade 1870-80, the population of the United States increased from 38,558,371 to 50,155,783. At the same rate of increase, the number in 1890 will be nearly 65½ millions. During the five years ending with 1884, the average annual consumption was nearly 324,000,000 bushels, and the average export 140,000,000 bushels. If the production in the five years ending with 1894 does not become greater, all but 43,000,000 bushels per annum, or less than 5½ million quarters, will be required for home consumption, and the surplus will not suffice for the increased population of the next five years. Before the end of the present century, then, the present production of wheat in the United States will be insufficient for home requirements, and the people of Europe will have to look elsewhere for that main portion of their foreign supply which now comes to them across the Atlantic. A continuance of recent prices for a few more years would not only prevent that surplus from keeping up to its recent average, but would prevent its production altogether. As already intimated, however, such a result is not to be apprehended, as the increasing demand of the world for wheat must send prices up to a remunerative standard, and then American production will once more advance steadily.

Taking the average value of the English wheat crop, at recent prices, to have been 8*l.* an acre, and that of the American crop to be 33*s.*, is there any reason why American competition should drive our wheat-growers from their accustomed industry? We think not, and we maintain that English farmers can continue to grow wheat at 8*l.* an acre longer than American farmers can keep on growing it at 33*s.* If the game of 'beggar my neighbour' is to go on, the American will be the first to throw up his hand. It is absurd to suppose that there is necessarily a difference of 6*l.* 7*s.* an acre in the cost of wheat-growing in the two countries. Our climate and soil are better for wheat than those of America, and the crop here is much less liable to serious damage or partial destruction. If we used no manure for wheat, we should, by keeping to our rotation of crops, grow about double the American average yield. At present English farmers are handicapped by high rents, tithes, rates, and railway rates; but all these can be reduced, and wages are only about half as high here as on the other side of the Atlantic, while almost everything that the farmer has to buy is a great deal cheaper in this country, in consequence of the Protectionist tariff of the United States. Mr. Bookwalter, a high financial authority in New York, and one who has farmed for twenty years.

years in a Western State, writing in 1884, estimated that the produce of one acre of wheat land in England would purchase as much of the farmer's requirements as four to six acres in America; and in this reckoning he allows two dollars an acre for straw, though he admits that it is not generally a source of profit in his own country. Mr. Bookwalter adds:—

‘The real advantages heretofore possessed by the American agriculturist, cheap lands (the rapid rise of which in recent years, and not the profits of farming, being the real source of his present wealth) and natural fertility are rapidly disappearing, and unless his Government removes the cause which operates to artificially increase cost of production, the English farmer will have year by year less cause to fear serious competition from America.’

We have before us a large number of estimates of the cost of growing wheat in different parts of the United States, but can only refer to them briefly in this article. In considering them, it is always to be borne in mind that whereas English farmers are given to grumbling, American farmers are disposed to brag. No one who is in the habit of reading crop reports in American papers can fail to observe their generally optimistic tone. Such phrases as ‘Look out for a bumper crop from this section’ are common, and the growing crops are nearly always over-rated early in the season. One reason of this is, that the American farmer is nearly always a prospective seller of his farm, if he owns it, and if not, a man is regarded as a traitor who depreciates the prospects of the district he lives in. Messrs. Read and Pell, when visiting the United States as Assistant-Commissioners to the Duke of Richmond’s Commission on Agriculture, found that, in order to see the ‘seamy side’ of the agriculture of any district, they had to enquire about it in another district, as they could never get the residents to admit anything to its disadvantage. American farmers, too, and their representatives in the Press, are desirous of impressing the world with the notion, that theirs is the country which can ‘lick creation’ in wheat production. This desire is openly expressed—to give one example—in a report issued by the Secretary of the Michigan Board of Trade in 1884, when, in response to an application from the Belgian Consul, he obtained a number of returns of the cost of wheat growing in different parts of the State. In his introductory remarks the Secretary said:—

‘The best policy would seem to be to figure cost as low as possible, consistent with truth, that wheat-growers in Western Europe may be advised of the hopelessness of competition, and reduce their wheat acreage.’

The

The following summary of the cost of growing an acre of wheat in Michigan is given:—

Labour	9.05 dollars.
Repairs, manuring, &c.	0.59 "
Rent	2.70 "
Transportation and trade charges	1.77 "
Total	14.11 "

The item of rent, when properly charged, is a serious one in settled parts of America, like Michigan. In an account from Illinois, the amount entered for rent is 24s. per acre, and the cost for growing an acre of wheat is said to amount to 3l. 12s. An Ohio farmer, writing in the Albany 'Cultivator and Country Gentleman,' states that the figures in the reports of the Washington Department of Agriculture and single State departments make the average cost of producing an acre of wheat in America 10½ dollars, or 42s., which is 10s. more than the average value of the crop per acre in 1885, according to the Department. Here, then, we have evidence from official sources leading to the conclusion, that the American wheat crop of 1885 was grown at a loss of over seventeen millions sterling. As the reports on the cost of wheat-growing, on which the official estimates are based, are probably too low by at least 10s. an acre on an average, the loss on the crop of 1885 may be put at fully double the amount just stated, or 34,000,000l. All but a very few of the estimates of expenses are obviously insufficient, because they do not include rent or interest, taxes, or miscellaneous expenses, and only one charges a proportion of the cost of the fallowed portion of the wheat land. Now, these are very heavy items to be left out of the accounts, and it is mainly because they are omitted that the loss on wheat-growing in America has been estimated above at an average of at least 17s. an acre, instead of at 10s. An American farmer, with his hired man, and perhaps a son or two, may be occupied nearly half the year in work that he cannot charge to any particular crop; and the wages he pays, and the cost of feeding and clothing himself and his family (or fair wages for those who work) should be charged against the crops that he sells off the land. So should the cost of repairs to buildings and fences, of wear and tear of implements and harness, insurance, and other items that have to be paid for, but do not form part of the expenses charged against any crop. Probably 10s. an acre is not too much to charge against the wheat crop for all kinds of miscellaneous expenses.

Abundance

Abundance of evidence showing the poverty of American wheat-growers is to be found in American papers; but only a few examples can be cited here. The St. Paul (Minnesota) correspondent of 'Bradstreet's,' one of the principal financial papers in the United States, writing in October 1884, said:—

'The farmer is not making money this year (a great crop year). With the prevailing range of grain prices the only questions that have practical interest are—how narrow is the margin that is left him for actual subsistence? how far he will be able to meet or defer pressing obligations incurred? what are the hopeful circumstances of this time of depression? and what are the remedies by which he will be likely to better his condition?'

What was true in 1884 was equally true in 1885 and 1886. In 1884, when the price of a fair grade of wheat was 63 cents at Minneapolis, the writer adds, the average North-Western farmer was not receiving more than 48 cents, after paying rail and trade expenses. Some good authorities in America have declared, that the farmer does not get a living profit when wheat at such centres as Chicago sells at less than a dollar per bushel, and that is equivalent to about 42s. a quarter in London, the price fixed by Mr. C. S. Read and Mr. Albert Pell, when they visited the United States as Assistant-Commissioners to the Royal Commission on Agriculture, in 1880, as the minimum at which the general run of American producers could sell in London with profit. At a recent meeting of the London Farmers' Club, Messrs. Read and Pell declared that they had seen no reason for altering their opinion. It is nothing to the purpose to state, that wheat has lately been often brought as ballast, free of charge. That is an accident, when it occurs, and, as it can never be counted on, it does not benefit the producer by a single cent. As it is notorious that railways in America and shipping companies have for some time been carrying wheat at a loss, there is more reason to expect an increase of the cost of sending wheat from the interior of America to Europe than to suppose that it will become less. At the time when the correspondent of 'Bradstreet's' stated that the North-Western farmer was getting only 15s. 4d. a quarter for his wheat, the average price of American spring wheat in London was 33s. 6d., a difference of 18s., and that was at a time when rail and sea freights were ruinously low. Between Chicago and London quotation for a given grade of American wheat the difference is usually 10s. per quarter, or a little more.

Mr. Frank Wilkeson, also writing to 'Bradstreet's' at the end of 1884, said:—

'The

'The wheat-farmers of America are to-day practically bankrupt. In the interior markets of Kansas wheat is selling for from 16 to 40 cents per bushel. . . . The demand for money at 3 per cent. per month in all the towns within the wheat-belt far exceeds the supply. Teams, tools, stock, grain, all are being rapidly mortgaged.'

He had previously stated that Western farmers generally had been obliged to mortgage their farms to meet their living expenses. He also declared that the apparent prosperity of Dakota was based on the expenditure of the capital procured by mortgaging the farm lands, and that the farmers were 'spending their farms.' The mortgages were at 8 to 10 per cent., and the impoverished farmers had to pay an additional 10 per cent. on renewal, so that their interest was really 11 to 12 per cent.

Mr. Samuel Sinnett, of Muscatine, Iowa, writing to the Dublin 'Farmers' Gazette,' says that more than half the farms in the West are mortgaged, and that all business is done on credit, 'on which 10 per cent. is charged, and as much more to meet the risk of loss.' It may be observed in this connection that in some States there is a legal maximum of interest, varying from 8 to 12 per cent., while in a few States any rate may be agreed upon in writing.

Worse than the farm mortgages are the crop mortgages, equivalent to our bills of sale, which are becoming so common in some parts of America that, according to the 'St. Louis Republican,' there is

'more or less clamour for legislation to regulate or prohibit the practice. Farmers who have rented land, or whose land is encumbered, it is said, give these crop mortgages as securities for supplies which they must have, and it is a common thing for them to use this credit to the extreme limit that the storekeeper will allow.'

When the crop is harvested, 'its entire proceeds often fall a little short of paying the mortgage, and the farmer is not only again without money or credit, but is actually in debt and under obligations to the storekeeper who has accommodated him.' Such a system of course, as an American journal in commenting upon the statement says, 'means high interest and high prices for everything the farmer buys.'

Further evidence as to the embarrassed condition of American farmers is to be found in great abundance in American papers. It is well known that in the North-West, and in other parts of America, the system of landlord and tenant has lately been very much extended, owing to mortgagors being unable to pay their interest, and giving up their farms to the mortgagees, afterwards becoming tenants. Deserted farms, again,

again, have become more numerous than ever before, and bankruptcies among farmers in the wheat-growing States have been so common as to excite comment. A writer in the Albany 'Country Gentleman' of December 21st, 1885, says: 'For a month or more, hardly a day has passed but several of these wheat-growers have filed petitions in insolvency.' Small crops, low prices, and high rates of interest on mortgages and other loans, are the causes assigned. As to the 'small crops' referred to, the writer explains himself by pointing out that, in the early days of settlement in San Joaquin County, 40 or even 60 bushels of wheat per acre were often harvested, whereas now, owing to the exhaustive system of farming pursued, the yield has dwindled till it is more often only 14 to 15 bushels, in this highly-favoured district. Similar evidence is given by Mr. G. W. Franklin, of Cass County, Iowa, as to the waning productiveness of that State; and it is the same wherever continuous wheat-growing is practised.

On all sides American farmers have been advised to grow less wheat, and to devote their attention to mixed husbandry. Mr. J. R. Dodge, the Statistician of the Department of Agriculture, already cited, in a recent article in the 'New York Tribune,' says:—

'It is foolish to extend any crop beyond the probability of demand, and reduce the price below the cost of production. . . . The low price of wheat will be a benefit to agriculture if it result in reducing the wheat area within 10 or 15 per cent. above the requirements for home consumption, and a better distribution of rural labour in the North-West, in the direction of meat, wool, oil and oil-cake, butter, cheese, and other products easy of transportation, as they should be required, at paying prices.'

The 'Pacific Rural Press' says:—

'The prairie lands of the West are already beginning to feel the blight of the single-crop system, and will soon have to be planted with other forms of vegetation to preserve their value for agricultural purposes. . . . The same process is already seen in California, particularly in the central portions of the Sacramento and in the Santa Clara and Napa valleys. Fruit is largely taking the place of wheat, and the more diversified is the new departure in the cultivation of those valleys, the more will their value increase.'

Another authority says, that wheat-growers in California are becoming poorer and poorer, while many fruit-growers have saved fortunes. Professor Henry, in a recent lecture at Richmond, Wisconsin, referred to the 'wicked habit of blighting prairie soil with annual wheat, and then adding insult to injury by burning

burning the straw. This practice,' he adds, 'will keep any people down.' One of the richest prairies in America, he tells us by way of illustration, is that of the St. Croix River, and wheat-growing there was carried on for a long time under exceptional advantages. But

'to-day the richest part of it is almost without fences; the majority of the farm buildings, especially the barns, are poor, and the people complain bitterly of hard times. . . . Had the people had smaller farms and a less fertile soil, enforcing mixed farming and attention to live-stock, they would have been far better off.'

The 'National Live Stock Journal' of Chicago, in its issue for November 30th, 1886, says:—

'There is no denying the fact that, under the influence of depressed prices, a large proportion of the farmers of the country have been exceedingly restive. . . . Wheat at the prices that prevail in the interior, that is, in the States west of the Mississippi River, is grown at a loss.'

It is generally admitted that the American farmer's life, as a rule, is one of excessive and almost incessant toil, and the scantiest reward, in money at any rate; while his wife is held up in America as a common object of pity. The difficulty of keeping farmers' sons on the land in America has long been notorious; whereas, in this country, the difficulty, until recently, has been to get them to adopt any other pursuit than farming.

Although we have not cited a tenth part of the evidence at our disposal, tending to show that the wheat-grower in the United States has suffered at least as severely as the British wheat-grower from the extremely low prices of the last three years, enough has been given to prove that, under fair conditions, above described, the wheat-grower in this country may fairly be expected to hold his own against American competition.

It is generally admitted that to the large increase in the supply of wheat from India, during recent years, the extremely low prices that have prevailed are mainly attributable. It is true that, owing to climatic conditions and occasional famines, India is an uncertain source of supply. For instance, after having sent us about 1,400,000 qrs. in 1877, the quantity fell off to less than 240,000 qrs. in 1879, and was only a little over 700,000 qrs. in 1880, when we were in need of a larger foreign supply than ever before, on account of the extremely unproductive harvest of 1879 in this country. Since 1880, however, the supply has not been less than 1,600,000 qrs. for any year, and

in 1885 it was about 2,800,000 qrs., a larger quantity than had previously been sent to us from India. The area of land under wheat in India has greatly increased of late, though, owing to the defective character of agricultural statistics in the past, no one can tell with any approach to accuracy what the increase has been. The total area under wheat in India in 1885-6 was not quite $27\frac{1}{2}$ million acres, and the yield about 32 million quarters, or 9.3 bushels per acre. The 'normal area,' as it is termed, is about 26 million acres, and the normal or ordinary average yield is 10 bushels per acre. Since 1883 there is no reason to suppose that any large increase in the wheat area has taken place; but the fact that, with such a small yield, Indian cultivators have extended their wheat fields at all during the prevalence of extremely low prices in Europe needs explanation. The explanation is very simple. The low gold-value of silver has had the effect of a handsome bounty on the export of wheat from India. There is an additional bounty in respect of the State-owned and State-guaranteed railways of India; but that is chiefly at the expense of Indian taxpayers, so that the benefit to the cultivators of the soil, who pay a very large proportion of the taxes, cannot be very great. The effect of the depreciated gold value of silver upon the export trade in Indian wheat, however, is so obvious that it is surprising to see it disputed. But for that depreciation, the export of wheat from India during the last three years must have been discontinued or carried on at a loss to producers, middle men, or exporters, or to all of them.

To estimate the cost of wheat-growing in a country like India, with its widely-varying circumstances, is very difficult, if not impossible. In a circular issued by the Government of India in 1884, a calculation made by an expert is given for what it is worth. In Northern India, in a district traversed by railways, he estimates the cost of producing a quarter of wheat on irrigated and manured land at 12s.; and a market rate of 18s. 6d. a quarter, he adds, would probably mean to the producer a price not exceeding 15s. or 16s. He takes the exchange value of the rupee to be 1s. 8d. in the calculation; so he estimates that the ryot of Northern India gets a fair profit, when wheat sells at about 11 rupees a quarter in an inland market. Now, in the same circular the Indian Government state that, in March 1884, wheat was selling 'at $22\frac{1}{2}$ seers the rupee, or about 18s. 6d. the quarter at Jubbulpore—a price which gave a good margin for profit to the exporter when the London rate was 43s. the quarter,' but not when the London rate had fallen to from 33s. to 36s. for Indian wheats. No doubt there was but a very small

small margin for profit, and our imports from India were more than 700,000 qrs. less in 1884 than in 1883; but the rate of exchange kept falling, and freights fell also, so that exporters were not obliged to cease operating altogether, though some heavy losses were incurred, any slight fluctuation in the rate of exchange making all the difference between profit and loss. It is almost certain that a decrease in merchant's and native dealer's profits, as well as a fall in freights and in the gold value of silver, helped to keep up the wheat exports of India. Our contention is that, if it had not been for the low exchange value of the rupee, exporters of Indian wheat would not have been able to offer enough for it to pay the cultivators' expenses, and that therefore the cultivation of wheat in India would have fallen off, or prices would have been forced up.

It is worthy of notice that the Indian Government, although anxious to make out that India has been in all respects injured by the depreciation in the gold value of the rupee, volunteers this admission :—

‘We do not believe that the entire fall in the English prices of either wheat or cotton is due to the fall in the rate of exchange; but we see no reason to doubt that the rate of exchange has had a material influence in bringing about this fall. As an illustration of the far-reaching effects of any considerable change in the relative value of gold and silver, and of the economic disturbance which it causes, we would call your Lordship's special attention to the fact that the Indian cultivator of wheat and cotton appears to have actually gained, while the English and American producer of these commodities has suffered, by the fall in the rate of exchange.’

As to the question whether the Indian cultivator is benefited by the low rate of exchange which allows of wheat exportation with the barest margin of profit to all concerned, Mr. A. R. Connell, who read a very able Paper on ‘Indian Railways and Indian Wheat’ before the Statistical Society a short time ago, appears to think that they are not. He contends that the peasantry grow their grain crops primarily for subsistence, and only to a small extent for sale; that only the small surplus over, after supplying the wants of themselves, their labourers, and their cattle, is affected by market prices; and that the largest part, if not all, of that surplus goes to the money-lender. Indeed, he appears to be of opinion that wheat-growing does not pay the ryot, but that the poor man is forced by the money-lender to grow the crop as the best means of obtaining ready money for the satisfaction of the usurious demands of his creditor. The cultivator's assessment is raised on account of the alleged rise in the value of the holding, owing to increased

railway communication and the development of the wheat trade, and Mr. Connell gives strong reasons for doubting whether the stimulus to wheat-growing in India is not altogether an unhealthy one, as far as the peasantry are concerned.

The inevitable conclusion seems to be, that British wheat-growers cannot compete with Indian producers when the rupee is less than about 1s. 10d. in exchange value, but that, if silver were not depreciated in proportion to gold, they would have no reason to fear Indian competition. There will always be a considerable European demand for the hard wheats of India, and wheat would be exported from that country in moderate quantity if the rupee went up to its old price of 2s. in gold value. As long as it remains greatly depreciated, European and American wheat-growers will have a hard struggle to maintain their industry.

That wheat-growing does not pay in Russia at such prices as have prevailed during the last three years is certain. The Russian Agricultural Department, in a recent Report, admits that the producer receives only one-third of the price paid in London, and that this, in many cases, is hardly sufficient to cover cost of production and transportation to the nearest railway station or river wharf. Other evidence goes further than this, and represents the condition of the agricultural classes of the Empire as miserable in the extreme. In the autumn of 1885, the Russian Government, to avert the ruin with which millions of the cultivators of the soil were threatened, deemed it necessary to offer loans of money on the security of the crops, at the not very charitable rate of interest of 6 per cent. Mr. J. Randich, a grain merchant, of Odessa, writing in 'Dornbusch's List' in July last, expresses the opinion that, although cereal production has not been checked in Russia, wheat-growing does not pay. Numerous complaints to that effect, he adds, have been made during the last two years, both in the assemblies of the zemstvos and in the small homesteads. It is, however, difficult to substitute any other crop for wheat, at any rate in Southern Russia, with its triennial rotation of crops; and the cultivators keep on producing the cereal at a loss, hoping for higher prices. Like the ryots of India, the Russian peasants are not, as a rule, free agents in the matter of cropping the land, being terribly oppressed by usurers, who practically compel them to grow crops that will bring in money promptly, whether at a profit or at a loss. Of course, unless prices rise, the end of this state of affairs is only a question of time. 'Stepniak,' in a remarkable series of letters on 'the Russian Agrarian Question,' recently contributed

contributed to the 'Times,' says, on the authority of Janson, that in thirteen provinces of Central Russia there has been a reduction of 27·8 per cent. in the quantity of harvested corn since 1864, in spite of an increase of 6·6 per cent. in the population ; many peasants having entirely given up husbandry. The same writer states, that it is common for the peasants to sell corn at a low price in September, only to buy some of it back at an advance of 30 to 50 per cent. to supply their needs during the winter and spring. To obtain what they need, it is their usual practice to place themselves in bondage to the *koulaks* or "mir-eaters," engaging to do an utterly unreasonable amount of labour on the land in lieu of paying in money, which they do not possess. It is by this means, to a great extent, that the cultivation of the crops is kept up, and the system is not one that can last.

The agriculture of Russia is wretched in the extreme, the large landowners alone employing machinery or using manures. The yield of the wheat crop appears to be below 8 bushels an acre, as a rule, and sometimes below 6 bushels. Any approach to exactness in Russian statistics is hopeless, no two accounts of crop areas or produce coinciding. In 1872, according to official figures, the wheat area of European Russia, exclusive of Poland, was a little under 29,000,000 acres, and the yield not quite 158,000,000 bushels, or less than 6 bushels per acre. In 1870-79, and in 1881, almost exactly the same acreage was returned, and in 1885 it was under 31,000,000 acres. During the whole period since 1870 the produce has varied as much as from 158,000,000 to 258,000,000 bushels. The latter quantity, returned for 1884, was quite unusual—in fact, the greatest crop ever grown in Russia ; yet the yield was less than 9 bushels an acre. Mr. Henry Ling Roth, in his interesting 'Sketch of the Agriculture and Peasantry of Eastern Russia,' gives 499 lbs., or 3 lbs. over 8 bushels of 62 lbs., as the average produce of wheat per acre during thirty-two years on black soil. This, he says, is above the mean yield for Russia as a whole, as the soil and management of the farm in question are much above average. The same writer states that 10 roubles per *sorokaya dessiatin*, or 7s. 2d. per acre, would be considered an average profit. This he says in reference to the year 1877, when the average price of wheat in England was nearly double what it was in 1886—56s. 9d., as compared with 31s. Unless expenses have been greatly reduced, the loss at recent prices must have been very heavy. No doubt, as Mr. Randich says in the article previously alluded to, the low rate of exchange for silver, as well as the reduced freights, helps
the

the export trade in Russian wheat, but not sufficiently to make its production profitable at recent prices.

Our imports of wheat and flour (nearly all grain) from Russia during the past ten years have varied extremely. In 1877, they amounted to nearly 2,538,460 qrs.; in 1883, to over 3,000,000 qrs.; and in 1885, to over 2,769,230 qrs.; whereas in 1880 they were under 700,000 qrs.; in 1884, only about 1,270,000 qrs.; and in 1886, in round figures, 856,000 qrs. The partial failure of the rye crop—the source of the staple food of the Russian peasantry, in any year necessitates the home consumption of a very large proportion of the wheat produced, and of the portion exported a great deal goes to Germany, Italy, and France. For these reasons, as well as from the great variation in the produce of the wheat crop in Russia, we cannot rely with any certainty upon that country for our supply of breadstuffs. Agricultural depression in Russia is probably worse than anywhere else in the world, and there is no reason to suppose that the Russian cultivator can profitably lay down wheat in England at a lower price than that at which our own farmers can grow it.

There is no reason to fear increased competition from Austria-Hungary, or Germany. The extra-fine quality of Hungarian flour gives it a market as a luxury in this and other countries. This is partly due to the high quality of the wheat, but also in great measure to the superiority of the milling machinery. Nearly all the bread-stuffs we import from Austria-Hungary come as flour, the quantity of wheat as grain being quite insignificant—only 22,000 qrs., in round figures, in 1885. Recently the millers of the United Kingdom have made a great advance in the perfecting of their machinery, and as they can get wheat of fine quality from various sources, they are now in a position to compete with the Hungarian millers. Our imports of wheat and flour from Germany have for a long time been decreasing, the total for the six years ending with 1885 having been only two-thirds of that for the previous six years. Besides, Germany is a wheat-importing country, her net imports of wheat and flour in 1884–5 having been equal to nearly 3,000,000 quarters of wheat; while the net exports of Austria-Hungary for the same cereal year were only equal to 500,000 quarters of wheat. That the recent low prices have very seriously affected the wheat-growers of these countries there is abundant evidence to show; but it is sufficient to point out, that both have recently raised their import duties on grain and flour. As population increases in these and other European countries, their

their ability to compete with British wheat-growers becomes less and less; and this remark applies to the Danubian Principalities and Turkey, from which we receive comparatively small quantities of wheat. Russia is the only great wheat-exporting country of Europe. Even with Russia, it must be borne in mind, Europe is not self-supporting in respect of wheat. A report recently issued by the American Department of Agriculture puts the average production of wheat in Europe at 1,144,000,000 bushels, and the consumption at 1,312,000,000 bushels, leaving a deficiency of 168,000,000 bushels. Since 1881 the wheat-area of Europe appears to have increased by about 3,000,000 acres, a quantity far from sufficient to supply the needs of the increased population.

The total wheat area of the Australasian Colonies was less by over half a million acres in 1885-6 than in 1883-4. For the later year, unfortunately, there were no official statistics for South Australia, and the estimate of the wheat acreage for that Colony given by the 'Adelaide Observer,' after collecting returns from farmers in all districts, is the best that is available for the year in question. The maximum wheat acreage was attained in 1883-4 (harvest beginning in November and finishing early in January), in which year 3,698,817 acres were produced. There was a small reduction in 1884-5, and a larger and more general one in the following year. The figures for the three years are given below:—

AREA of the WHEAT CROP in AUSTRALASIA.

COLONY.	1883-4.	1884-5.	1885-6.
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
New South Wales	289,757	273,249	264,867
Victoria	1,104,392	1,096,354	1,020,082
South Australia	1,846,151	1,942,453	1,630,000
Queensland	10,742	15,942	13,299
Western Australia	28,768	29,416	29,511
Tasmania	41,301	34,091	30,266
New Zealand	377,706	270,042	173,891
Total	3,698,817	3,663,548	3,161,916

Comparing the areas of the last two years, it will be seen that there was a decrease in every colony, except Western Australia, where the wheat crop is insignificant. In South Australia, where about half the wheat grown in the whole of Australasia had been for several years produced, the decrease

was

was nearly one-sixth; while in New Zealand less than half the wheat area of 1883-4 appears for 1885-6.

In every one of these colonies, except Tasmania, there had been a steady, though not in all cases regular, increase in wheat-growing for the ten years ending with 1883-4, and there is every reason to believe that the falling-off after that year is attributable to the great fall in price which took place in 1884. The wheat crop ceased to pay, and less of it was grown. South Australia, dependent mainly upon wheat-growing, increased her acreage in desperation in 1884-5, and has been nearly ruined by her losses, which culminated with the failure of the harvest of 1885-6, when the average yield of wheat was under 3½ bushels an acre. The average yield of the wheat crop in South Australia during the last fourteen years has been only 7½ bushels per acre, and it needs no evidence to prove that, with such a miserable produce, wheat-growing for export cannot possibly pay when the grain is selling in England at any price less than 40s.; while there cannot be much profit, if any, at that price. When the average price in England is 40s. a quarter, or 5s. a bushel, Australian farmers would not get more than 4s. a bushel at the outside, at the nearest railway station, and at that price the average return would be less than 30s. an acre. Some South Australian writers declare that wheat can be grown in their colony at less expense than anywhere else in the world. If that be true, it does not follow that, with the miserable yield obtained, the grain can be grown at less per bushel, and if there is not an actual loss on a crop that brings in less than 30s. an acre, there cannot be a living profit. What then must be the consequence, when wheat is selling in England at an average of 30s., or even at that of 35s.? The result must be ruin if wheat for export is relied on for a livelihood, and ruin has actually overtaken numbers of South Australian farmers. They have had to go to their Government more than once for relief from even the low rents which they contracted to pay, and in 1886 a number of them appealed to the Government for a loan to enable them to buy seed-corn. Last year Australia did not grow wheat enough for home consumption, and had to import for the first time from India, as well as from California. In consequence of scarcity, wheat was higher in price in the Australasian Colonies than in England. Still the yield was so extremely small that there must have been a very heavy loss on the production of the crop, at any rate in South Australia.

For some years the journals which circulate among Australian farmers have been urging them, and particularly South Australian farmers, to apply themselves to mixed farming, and not to rely

rely too much on the wheat crop. Lately the ruinous consequences of disregarding this good advice have been frequently dwelt upon in the Colonial papers.

Victoria is the only Australian colony besides South Australia which, in an average of seasons, grows more wheat than is required for home consumption, unless Western Australia has an utterly insignificant surplus. New South Wales and Queensland never produce sufficient for home use, but import from South Australia and Victoria. The average yield of wheat in Victoria for the twelve years 1873-84 was $12\frac{1}{2}$ bushels an acre; consequently, although the crop costs more per acre to produce than in South Australia, it is probably grown at a lower cost per bushel. No one pretends, however, that wheat-growing has paid in Victoria during the last two years.

New Zealand, with its fertile soil, and a twelve years' average of over $26\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat to the acre, or within about $1\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of the 'ordinary average' of the United Kingdom, might have been regarded as a formidable competitor to the British grower. The figures given previously, however, show that the farmers of that colony were not disposed to send us wheat at recent prices. The acreage of the wheat crop fell off by more than one-half in two years after 1883-4, and the inevitable conclusion is that the farmers of New Zealand cannot profitably send the grain to us when our average is under 40s.; for it was but little under that price when the New Zealand crop of 1884-5 was sown, and yet there was a decrease in the acreage of more than one-fourth, as compared with that of the previous year.

Australian and New Zealand wheats in good condition sell at prices above the English average; but, in spite of this advantage, due to fine climate, all evidence goes to show that the farmers of those colonies cannot profitably send us wheat when our average is less than 40s. a quarter; and it is doubtful whether they would again send and keep up the supplies they sent us a few years ago, even if our average could be fixed at that amount. Probably they will require the incentive of an average rising occasionally at least as high as 45s. to induce them to make a business of growing for our markets.

In spite of all that has been written in glorification of Canada as an agricultural country, it is safe to assert, that British wheat-growers have no reason to fear the competition of that colony. In 1874 we imported from the whole of British North America wheat and flour equal to 991,919 qrs. of wheat; by 1879 the quantity had risen to the highest point it has ever attained,
1,235,469 qrs.;

1,235,469 qrs.; and in 1885 the total was only 483,548 qrs. Last year the quantity was 935,567 qrs.; but as the production of wheat in Canada was smaller in 1885 and 1886 than in 1884, this apparent partial recovery must be due to an increase in exports of American wheat shipped from Canadian ports. The decline in exports from Canada to the United Kingdom, however, is far from being the most fatal exposure of the pretensions of the Dominion as a wheat-exporting country. Before this article is published, the details of Canadian exports and imports for the fiscal year ended June 30th, 1886, will be available, and it is safe to predict that they will prove Canada to be a wheat-importing country, while for the current fiscal year the balance of imports must be considerable. In the fiscal year ended June 30th, 1885, Canada imported 3,128,143 bushels of wheat and 565,562 barrels of flour, as compared with 2,340,956 bushels of wheat and 123,777 barrels of flour of home production exported to all countries. Still, as her total exports, including foreign products, amounted to 5,423,805 bushels of wheat and 161,054 barrels of flour, there was a small balance of exports, and but a small one indeed. The balance of wheat exported was 2,295,662 bushels, equal to 286,958 qrs.; and the balance of flour imported was 404,508 barrels, equal to 202,254 qrs. of wheat. The net balance of exports, then, was only 84,704 qrs. As the deficiencies of the last two harvests were many times greater than this small balance of exports, there must have been a balance of imports in the last fiscal year, and a larger one is to be expected in the current year. After all, much as it may surprise most people to learn that Canada is a wheat-importing country, there is nothing unusual in this excess of imports over exports. In five years out of the twelve ending with 1884, the imports of wheat exceeded the exports of home-grown and foreign together, while the imports of flour were in nearly every year in excess of the exports. The low prices of recent years have brought matters to a climax, and Canada has ceased to grow enough wheat for her own consumption.

With this statement it may seem that the question of Canadian competition with British wheat-growers might be considered as settled; but as we do import from the Dominion small quantities of wheat and flour, to all effects and purposes borrowed from the United States to be sent to us, a few figures and statements in relation to the Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba are desirable.

In 1881 nearly two million acres of wheat were grown in Ontario, and only a little over fifty-one thousand acres in Manitoba. By 1886 the area in Ontario had been reduced by nearly half a million acres, while that of Manitoba had increased

by

by less than two-thirds of the decrease in the other Province. The acreage and officially-estimated produce for the last three years are given below :—

	1884.		1885.		1886.	
	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.
Ontario .	1,586,387	35,327,292	1,674,599	30,608,162	1,463,867	27,585,577
Manitoba	307,020	6,174,172	367,429	7,014,219	380,247	5,829,186
Totals	1,893,407	41,501,464	2,042,028	37,622,381	1,844,114	33,414,763

Here there appears a continuous decrease in produce, though the acreage was a little larger in 1885 than in 1884. In 1886 the wheat area dropped below that of 1884. In the area for 1886 in Manitoba there are included 16 acres of winter wheat, all that survived out of 39 acres planted by way of experiment. Clearly Canada is falling more and more behind in her efforts to supply her own population with wheat, to say nothing of 'feeding Europe,'—a feat which it has been boasted that Manitoba alone could accomplish.

A substantial rise in the price of wheat would, no doubt, send the acreage of the crop up to a higher level than it has ever before reached in the Dominion; but it is doubtful whether Canada will ever become a great wheat-growing country. In Ontario the acreage of the crop decreased before prices were low enough to cause depression in other countries, simply because it paid the farmers better to grow barley and peas (which they produce in great abundance and of high quality), and to devote their attention to dairying, in which they have made much progress.

The mean yield of wheat in Ontario for six years, 1881-1886, was 18·2 bushels per acre; that in Manitoba for five years was 19·7. The figures up to 1884 are taken from the Colonial Abstract, and those for the two remaining years from the reports of Canadian officials. In the 'Report of the Department of Agriculture of Manitoba for 1882' the area of the wheat crop does not appear; therefore the gap in the Colonial Abstract cannot be filled up. It is extremely difficult to verify the statements made by Canadian officials, because the statistics supplied are so defective. For instance, the 'Annual Report of the Ontario Department of Agriculture for 1885' does not give the acreage of any crop, and a similar omission in a Report

Report for Manitoba has already been noticed. Thus, when Manitoba is officially declared to be 'the premier wheat district of the world,' with an average yield of 29 bushels to the acre, the means of contradicting that ridiculous exaggeration are not so ready to hand as they should be.

That wheat-growing in Ontario has not been remunerative during the last three years is generally admitted in Canada. To give one extract out of a large number which might be quoted, the Toronto 'Globe' of February 12, 1886, says:—

'It must be borne in mind that the condition of Ontario agriculture has already become identical with that of England in one respect—very few farmers in either country can make money out of wheat. Undoubtedly the change necessitated by the growing of enormous bodies of wheat on the Western and North-Western prairies will force Ontario farmers to follow in the lines laid down by British experience. Those will be wisest who take advantage of this experience without waiting till they are compelled to fly to it as a refuge from bankruptcy.'

The same journal says that 'few farmers in Ontario consider it pays to sell wheat at less than one dollar a bushel,' that is, 32s. a quarter. During recent years many of them have had to accept about half that price. No wonder if, as Sir Richard Cartwright says, farm lands in Ontario are not worth so much by millions of dollars as they were six years ago. As in the United States, the farmers of Ontario, and of Manitoba too, have been on all sides advised to devote their attention more to the production of meat, milk, cheese, and butter, and less to wheat.

The soil of Manitoba is undoubtedly very fertile; but the climate is too arctic even for wheat. In four years out of the last six the crop was more or less seriously injured by being frozen just before it was ripe. Crops caught thus by frost are greatly diminished in yield, and the grain produced is shrivelled and of but little value. This risk, in addition to a short and precarious period for seeding, is more than sufficient to counteract the advantage of a fertile soil. Last year, according to Mr. Aubrey, of Broadview, North-Western Territories, drought caused a 'total failure' of the crops in 'thousands of cases,' thousands of acres not being worth cutting, and not having been cut. 'Throughout the country,' he adds, 'times are very hard, from Winnipeg away west to the Rockies.' His letter, dated November 28th, 1886, was published in the 'Suffolk Chronicle.' A correspondent of an English agricultural paper, who resides in Manitoba, says:—'The great obstacle to farming is the long winter. From November to April you can do nothing, and the horses

horses are standing idle, so that, to farm fifty acres, you need to have one hundred broken, and crop it alternately, fifty each year.' Where such a system is pursued, the expenses of the whole acreage should be charged against the cropped portion, and this is never done in the fantastical estimates of the cost of wheat-growing in Manitoba and the rest of the Canadian North-West, which have appeared from time to time in English papers. According to Major Bell and his numerous English admirers, a large profit was obtained on the great Bell Farm, Qu'Appelle Valley, by growing wheat at 11s. 2d. a quarter. At least, it was said that 8 per cent. on the capital was returned by crediting that amount to each quarter grown. Unfortunately the Great Bell Farm has gone the way of nearly all the other 'Mammoth farms' of the North American Continent, and has been placed in the market, as visitors to the Colonial Exhibition may have noticed. The shareholders apparently were not satisfied with 8 per cent.

There are always dissatisfied people in a colony ready to abuse it, and Manitoba can scarcely be so black as it has been painted by some writers, while it certainly is not the agricultural El Dorado depicted by others. The correspondent of an agricultural paper previously quoted said, in 1885, that there were 300 farms in a single county near Winnipeg, to be sold for taxes. That may have been an exaggeration; but that farms in considerable number in Ontario and Manitoba alike have been sold to satisfy the demands of tax-collectors is a fact beyond all dispute. When it is seen that the total value of agricultural products exported from Canada fell from 31 million dollars in 1881-2 to a little over 14½ million in 1884-5, it would be strange indeed if the country had not suffered from agricultural depression.

Even if all the accounts of destitution among settlers in Manitoba be discredited, it is obvious that a country which has added to its wheat area less than 330,000 acres in five years, will be a long time in becoming the 'granary of the world.' The fact is, that nothing short of the prospect of a handsome fortune will tempt a large population to a colony far colder than Siberia, and it is certain that no fortunes have yet been made by wheat-growing in Manitoba. As in most parts of the United States, it is land-jobbing, and not farming, which has enriched the few who have made much money in the agricultural districts of that Colony.

Twenty years ago Chili and the Argentine Republic were each described as 'the future granary of the world.' From Chili
in

in 1874 we received over two million hundredweights of wheat, and, except in 1883, we have never received nearly as much from that country since. In 1886 the quantity was 1,701,695 cwt., or less than 400,000 qrs., not enough to feed the people of the United Kingdom for six out of the 365 days in a year. According to a recent Consular Report there has been very little advance in Chilian agriculture in recent years. The farmer still ploughs with a pointed piece of wood, and his harrow is a bundle of bushes. The yield of wheat averages about 4 bushels to the acre, including a large proportion of dirt. In 1880 the wheat area was about 6,000,000 acres, and there appeared to be no increase in 1885.

The Argentine Republic sent us 77,421 qrs. of wheat in 1885, a little over a day's consumption for the United Kingdom, and that is the largest quantity we have ever received from the country. Last year, wheat was so scarce in the Republic that it was 6s. 6d. per bushel of 56 lb., or 54s. per English quarter, and there were outcries for the removal of the duty of 40 per cent. levied on foreign wheat. The Buenos Ayres 'Standard' admits that the River Plate Provinces cannot compete with the United States in the production of wheat for export, and recommends the devotion of an increased proportion of the capital of the country to pastoral industry.

It has been too hastily assumed that, in the struggle for existence among wheat-growers, the British, the best farmers in the world, will not be among the fittest who will survive. The evidence adduced in the foregoing remarks appears to show this assumption to be unfounded. In all parts of the world, with the doubtful exception of India, wheat growers have been partly or wholly ruined by the long period of low prices, and British growers have only suffered with the rest. If we are to have another year of such low prices as had prevailed for three years up to the end of 1886, the wheat area of the world will probably be contracted by many millions of acres, and bread once more may become temporarily dear. At the time of writing, however, there is reason to expect a sufficient rise in the price of wheat to encourage farmers everywhere to sow at least their usual acreage for another year. A very great rise in price is neither to be expected nor desired, even in the interest of growers, as it would infallibly lead to over-production once more.

- ART. VII.—1. *Christophe Plantin, Imprimeur Anversois*. Par Max Rooses, Conservateur du Musée Plantin-Moretus. Anvers, 1882.
2. *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*. Publiée par Max Rooses. Anvers. Vol. I. 1883, Vol. II. 1885.
3. *La Maison Plantin à Anvers. Monographie complète de cette Imprimerie célèbre, Documents historiques sur l'Imprimerie, etc.* Par Léon Degeorge. Paris, 1886.
4. *Annales Plantiniennes depuis la fondation de l'Imprimerie Plantinienne à Anvers jusqu'à la mort de Chr. Plantin*. Par C. Ruelens et A. De Backer. Paris, 1866.
5. *Catalogue du Musée Plantin-Moretus*. Par Max Rooses. Anvers, 1881.

IN the year 1876 the city of Antwerp, aided by a subvention from the State, purchased the Hotel Plantin, with its entire contents and dependencies, for one million two hundred thousand francs. Large as was the price, it cannot be deemed excessive; for the Musée Plantin-Moretus, as it is now called, is unique among European Museums. The building forms a large quadrangle, and the visitor on entering finds himself carried back to the days of Alva and Farnese. Through the ample, but not extravagant, apartments of a wealthy merchant's dwelling he passes into the offices and workshops requisite for the business of a royal printer, bookseller, and publisher. Pictures and portraits by Rubens and other Flemish artists decorate the walls. Engravings of singular merit and rarity hang in profusion and fill quaint oaken presses. Copper-plates and wooden blocks—head- and tail-pieces—initial letters of giant size and dainty device—countless store of type, Hebrew, Greek, Gothic, Italian, Roman, cast in the days when type-founding was an art which, like so many of its sisters, sprang into perfection from its birth, in contemptuous disregard of modern theories of gradual development—matrices, and punches, and printing presses, all occupy the places they filled three centuries ago. The correctors' tables suggest the memory of the painstaking accuracy with which (as we shall see) not only learned men, but young girls, pored over proofs of sacred and classic literature in the original Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. The library contains a very large and valuable collection of impressions from the famous press whose issues were of high, in some cases of unparalleled, artistic merit, and many of whose slight brochures have become rarities. The shop recalls the days when a passing student could purchase for a trifle editions for which the book-hunter now sighs in vain. Yet this enumeration

tion embraces but a tithe of the contents of the Musée Plantin. The archives of the firm contain thousands of documents—minutes of Plantin's entire correspondence, as well as a multitude of letters addressed to him; account-books, day-books, and ledgers; inventories, catalogues, and price-lists; records of payments to authors and correctors, to printers, engravers, bookbinders, and workmen of every craft; deeds of conveyance, contracts, privileges, and royal warrants; *cahiers* of the half-yearly fairs at Frankfort; current accounts with sovereigns, princes, and cardinals, as well as with ordinary mercantile correspondents at home and abroad. So vast is the mass of material, that M. Rooses does not exaggerate in affirming that no similar record is in existence of the life of any private person who lived three centuries ago.

Christopher Plantin was born near Tours, in the year 1514. He lost his mother at an early age, and his father, flying from the plague, which was raging in Touraine, migrated to Lyons, where he entered the service of Canon Claude Porret. A boyish intimacy with Pierre Porret—a nephew of the Canon—ripened into a lifelong friendship, and proved of lasting service. The two lads set off for Paris to take advantage of its schools. Porret remained in the French capital, where he seems to have combined very considerable mercantile transactions with the practice of medicine. Plantin eventually apprenticed himself to a bookbinder at Caen, from whence he removed with his wife in 1548 or 1549 to Antwerp. In the following year he was enrolled on the list of burgesses, and was admitted as a printer into the guild of S. Luke.

Antwerp, at the period of Plantin's arrival, was the commercial capital of the Netherlands and of Europe. Two thousand vessels of the largest tonnage could anchor within its spacious harbours; yet so thronged were its quays, that ships had frequently to wait for weeks before they were able to discharge their cargoes. The wealth, luxury, and magnificence of the city were unrivalled throughout Western Europe, and all the arts of civilized life flourished in so favourable an atmosphere. A special quarter—the Kammerstraete—was the resort of all sections of the book trade, and here printers, booksellers, typesetters, bookbinders, and clasp-makers abounded, when Plantin settled amongst them. He commenced business modestly enough as a bookbinder and tanner of morocco; his wife, as a dealer in linen, and the lace for which the Low Countries had even then long enjoyed a European reputation. Plantin's skill in bookbinding and casket-making—in which he is said to have been unrivalled—soon attracted attention and made him

him known, writes a contemporary, both 'to Mercury and the Muses, to the rich merchants and the men of learning,' when an accident threatened a premature conclusion to so promising a career.

Signor Gabriel de Cayas, Secretary of Philip II., having occasion to send a jewel of great value to the Queen of Spain, had ordered a casket for it from Plantin, and shortly after giving him this commission he sent an earnest request that the box might be finished and delivered the same evening, as the royal courier would start for Madrid on the morrow at high tide. Accordingly at nightfall Plantin set out with the casket, accompanied by a servant carrying a torch. Presently he fell in with some masked and drunken revellers, who, mistaking him for a musician from whom they had received some real or imaginary affront, attacked and wounded him so severely, that his life was despaired of. The disaster proved a blessing in disguise, and changed the whole current of Plantin's life. It rendered him incapable of pursuing without serious inconvenience his old occupation, and induced him to adopt that of a printer, and it secured him the lasting friendship of two powerful champions, Goropius Becanus, his physician, and Secretary Cayas.

Abundant illustration is afforded, in Plantin's correspondence, of the difficulties by which, in his time, publishers and booksellers were beset. 'I thought you were aware,' he writes to an author who complained of delay in the publication of his works, 'that we are not permitted to send anything to the press, from a single epigram or a notelet to a voluminous work, until the entire book has been perused, approved, and countersigned by the theologians appointed for the purpose, and then we must further obtain the licence of the Court to print.' We shall advert presently to the severity of the decrees by which the censorship of the press was defined; but in addition to the sterner perils thus involved, a host of minor but irritating inconveniences arose in the administration of the law. At one time, the authorized censor might lose the manuscript sent for his perusal; at another, he might prove unacquainted with the language in which it was written; on a third occasion, when his approbation had been obtained, the Privy Council might be absent from Brussels on more urgent business than according permission to print an alphabet or an almanack. Not unfrequently the literary inquisitor was in the pay and interest of a rival publisher, and would purposely delay his *imprimatur* until the appearance of a competing edition had rendered useless all the pains and expense which had been incurred.

The whole question of copyright was a difficult and precarious one. In the case of theological and liturgical books—which were subject to the severest scrutiny—the commands of the Sovereign were sometimes incompatible with the requirements of the Pope. It is easy to imagine what scope there was for intrigue and exercise of backstairs influence; what long and wearisome waiting for approbation, delayed through pressure of business or chicanery; what opportunity for bribery, more or less veiled; what waste of time and money in journeys to Court, and audiences of influential ministers. Even when all these difficulties had been successfully surmounted, some audacious rival might have the boldness to publish, unauthorized, the very work in question, so that the bewildered Plantin begins to doubt whether the Papal decrees have any force beyond the States of the Church. To what purpose has the Holy Father issued his Bull that the unauthorized publishers of ecclesiastical books incur excommunication ‘*sub pœnâ latæ sententiæ*,’ if those who violate his commands are so insolent as to print this very Bull at the head of their pirated editions?

Many hindrances resulted from the distracted condition of the Low Countries, and the insecurity of transit to foreign lands. Plantin complains of heavy tolls on the passage of goods, of bales of books dropped into the water as they are being landed from the packet, of the interruption of traffic with important commercial centres, of the great migration (in 1567) from Antwerp and consequent stagnation of trade, of the repeated failure in the delivery of letters. The latter trouble was of such frequent occurrence, that correspondence was largely carried on in duplicate. At times, suitable paper for printing could not be procured, or, when found, would not bear the heavy cost of carriage. Trade was often too slack to supply ready money for immediate necessities, and the prompt and satisfactory supply and exchange of books was impossible when works of such ordinary use as Demosthenes and Isocrates—Plautus and Galen—Eusebius and Clemens Alexandrinus—were not to be met with. The years 1568 and 1569 were exceptionally disastrous. The regency of Margaret and the government of Granvelle had conspicuously failed, and the general uncertainty stifled credit so completely, that no one would become security for even the most upright and most solvent of his fellows. The lamentable outbreak of the beggars, and the sack of Antwerp Cathedral, caused well-founded forebodings of royal vengeance, that hung like a nightmare over the city.

‘Times are so hard’ (writes Plantin, March 26, 1569) ‘that students have no heart to buy any more books, and it seems now to

to very many persons that literature and those who promote it are in some sort the foes of God and nature. May God in His mercy incline the heart of the King and his magistrates to compassion and pity towards his poor people, who desire to acknowledge their faults, and not destroy the good and penitent with the rebellious and the obstinate.'

We have been led beyond the period of Plantin's start as a bookseller, but when his first publication was issued, the book-trade was encircled with such perils as might well dismay the stoutest heart. By an edict, dated April 29, 1550, the penalty of death was decreed against all who should maintain or preach the doctrines of the Reformers of Wittenberg, of Zurich, or of Geneva; or should print or transcribe, sell, buy or distribute, read or keep, any of their books. The like penalty attached to any dealing with books which had appeared during the last ten years preceding, without the name of the author and the printer, or with any work tainted with heresy or unsound doctrine in the text or in the preface. The owners of such books were at once to surrender them, under pain of being burnt alive for male, and of being buried alive for female, offenders. Masters were made responsible for the acts of their workpeople. No one could become a printer without the Imperial permission, which was only granted upon proof of capacity and certificate of good conduct, as well as upon oath neither to print nor cause anything to be printed, except in the town where he was enrolled as a citizen. A copy of every new book was to be deposited with the censor of the press, and booksellers were not allowed so much as to open their parcels save in the presence of this official. Every bookshop was required, under a penalty of 100 florins, to possess a list of prohibited works drawn up by the University of Louvain, and a catalogue of the entire stock. This ordinance was to be republished every six months, and to be strictly enforced, all privileges, ordinances, statutes, customs or usages to the contrary notwithstanding.

Plantin was soon to learn that so comprehensive an edict was no mere *brutum fulmen*. In 1558 he had published a work called 'German Theology—a treatise upon How we must put off the Old Man and put on the New,' which the authors of the 'Annales Plantiniennes' describe as so strange a medley of fanatic and Anabaptist teaching that it is incomprehensible how it could have obtained the Imprimatur of Louvain. Whether misgiving was aroused by this production, or whether any suspicion attached to Plantin of being concerned in the far grosser violation of Papal and Imperial behests of which he had secretly been guilty, we cannot determine; but on February 20, 1562,

Margaret of Parma wrote to Jean d'Immerseel, Margrave of Antwerp, bidding him send her a copy of a book which it was believed had been issued from Plantin's establishment; as, although it bore neither his name nor address, the type resembled that of his publications. The whole family (it was added), save the corrector of the press and a female servant, were thought to be tainted with heresy. The Margrave was therefore enjoined at once to pay a domiciliary visit to Plantin's house, to seize any copies of the incriminated book, and further to act as the royal edict required. On the first of March the Margrave replied, that immediately on the receipt of her Highness's letter he had been to Plantin's dwelling, but found that the owner and his family had left some few weeks before for Paris; that with the assistance of the corrector and a Spanish reader, he had discovered the persons who were guilty of printing the brochure in question, entitled '*Briefue Instruction pour Prier,*' and that the latter declared the work had been done at their cost, and without the knowledge of Plantin or of any of his family. Immerseel further stated that the impression had only been struck off eight or nine days previously, and that the whole edition of a thousand copies had been at once despatched to Metz. Forthwith the inquisitor received orders from Brussels to apprehend Plantin's family, the handmaid included, from whom and from the young daughters of the household important revelations were expected. A further investigation resulted in the discovery of a Flemish translation of the guilty book, in the seizure of nearly a thousand copies of the French edition, which was now admitted to have comprised 1500 copies, and in the strict imprisonment of the guilty persons, who no doubt were rigorously dealt with.

Such an incident at a period of widespread dissatisfaction with, and imminent revolt against, ecclesiastical and imperial tyranny, was calculated seriously to compromise Plantin; and the Margrave had further orders to interrogate the workmen, and sift the whole conduct of the establishment most thoroughly, that he might discover whether at an earlier date anything heretical had been issued. There was reason to presume that the house 'was not entirely clean as regards religion.' Immerseel, however, reported that no evidence against Plantin was forthcoming, and that he consequently awaited his explanations on his return from France. It is plain that the enquiry was conducted in no unfriendly spirit by the municipal authorities; and when Plantin returned to Antwerp, after an absence of more than a year-and-a-half, the affair had blown over. On two or three subsequent occasions some question was raised about

Plantin's

Plantin's orthodoxy; and in a contemporary list his name was entered as a Calvinist, along with that of his friend, Alexander Graphæus, the town clerk of Antwerp, and his trade partners, the Bômberghes; but he succeeded in gaining the entire confidence of the authorities. Indeed, the *protégé* of Granvelle and Cayas, the favoured publisher of the Papal Curia, to whom was entrusted the production of the sealed liturgical books for Spain and the Netherlands, above all the royal printer and chosen architypographer of Philip II., armed by royal mandate with exceptional powers to repress heresy amongst his fellows, must have been believed to be orthodox beyond all suspicion. Yet, incredible as it may seem, the man who enjoyed such exceptional patronage was all the while an affiliated member of an Anabaptist sect. The circumstances of the case, and the evidence by which Plantin's connection with the Family of Love is established, are remarkable enough to deserve a somewhat more detailed notice.

Considerable obscurity overhangs the doctrines of the Anabaptist community, which assumed the title of the Family of Love. Its founder, Henri Niclaes, a native of Münster, was a successful merchant, who combined the pursuit of commerce in Holland and the Low Countries with the propagation of his religious opinions. From an early age he had been wont to see visions and dream dreams, and when only eight years old had been vouchsafed direct and divine inspiration to resolve the religious difficulties which perplexed him. Some few names of eminence for learning, notably those of Guillaume Postel, and the geographer, Ortelius, are found in the scanty list of his adherents in France, Holland, and the Netherlands; but his doctrines obtained wider acceptance in England, where they survived till the middle of the seventeenth century, and were deemed important enough for elaborate refutation in a ponderous and long forgotten folio entitled, 'The Explanation of the Grand Mystery of Godliness,' by the learned and mystic Dr. Henry More. If the representations of an avowed opponent may be accepted, the pretensions of Henry Niclaes were blasphemously extravagant. He asserted that, as there had been a time for the service of Law under God the Father, and then a service of Faith under Christ the Son, so now there was to be a service of Love under the Holy Ghost; to which service Niclaes claimed to be God's appointed guide and mediator. Nor did the prophet of this new dispensation shrink from adopting all the logical consequences of so tremendous a prerogative. He himself was the man of whom St. Paul had spoken to the Athenians as ordained by God to judge the world in righteousness. Himself and his followers
alone

alone possessed true illumination and exclusive spiritual understanding. Alike saved and sinless, they had attained the secret of that complete inner union with God, which is the highest aspiration of man, but which outside the Family of Love he must long for in vain.

The form, in which Nicolaes put forth his visionary theories, was almost as singular as their substance. The greater portion of his numerous writings has perished, but a unique copy of his chief work, 'Den Spiegel der Gerechtigheit' (the 'Mirror of Righteousness'), has been discovered in the Library of the University of Leyden, and was placed at the disposal of M. Rooses. His description of its contents shows that it might serve as a model for the modern parliamentary obstructionist.

'It is a veritable punishment of Tantalus to complete the reading of this book. In vain does one try to discover any clear sense or definite idea in it. I should call it an interminable string of detached thoughts and vague impressions which had possessed the author's mind, and which he had committed pell-mell to paper in the cloudy and confused state in which they had occurred to him. There are hundreds of pages filled with scriptural quotations without any mutual cohesion, with mystic paraphrases, with moral exhortations, with lines of reasoning commenced and abandoned ten times over, resumed and repeated without plausible reason, forming a motley mass which enervates and repels the reader, without allowing him one glimpse of a large or clean-cut thought. Only at long intervals is the monotony of this long string of phrases broken by a comparison or an allegory laboriously worked out, and scarcely throwing any glimpse of light upon the reasoning.'—'Christopher Plantin,' p. 64.

It is difficult to understand how a man of such clear practical intelligence as Plantin could either have embraced so fantastic a creed, or how he could have at the same time stoutly asserted his invariable and unqualified fidelity to the Roman Church, without (as M. Rooses delicately expresses it) 'too much hypocrisy.'

With regard to the former of these questions, M. Rooses reminds us that religious fanaticism has not—as, for example, in the case of the earlier Quakers or modern Mormonites—been found inconsistent with the keen and successful pursuit of worldly prosperity. Unquestionably Nicolaes possessed powers of attraction, and despite Dr. More's assertion that he clothed himself in scarlet satin, retained questionable females under his roof, and owned, *proh pudor*, a gigantic mirror, his character was probably better than his creed. But in a day when the more prominent men on both sides appeared to have forgotten the

the most fundamental element in the creed which they professed ; when religious hatred was a prominent characteristic ; when a mushroom sect of yesterday persecuted (if able) as mercilessly as its most powerful opponents ; was it strange that plain, straightforward men should be drawn to teaching, which, turning alike from the horrible despotism of Philip and the destructive iconoclasm of the Reformers, proclaimed as its own grand central truth no mean article of the Christian faith, viz., "that the end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart and of faith unfeigned" ?

On the second point, there is more to be said on Plantin's behalf than that it was a day of universal dissimulation, when the policy of Machiavelli could claim every crowned head in Europe as an enthusiastic follower, and when the ruthlessness of the Inquisition would palliate, if not excuse, some concealment. Nicolaes held all outward forms of religion to be equally allowable and equally contemptible. He did not require his adherents to separate from the communion of Rome. Yet it is impossible to reconcile Plantin's acts with his assertion in a letter to Mofflin, one of Philip II.'s chaplains, in March 1568, that he had 'never on his conscience had any familiarity, commerce, agreement, or undertaking, on any occasion, with any one in anything contrary to the holy Catholic and Roman religion.' How far such a statement could be justified 'without too much hypocrisy' we shall see immediately.

Among the buried treasures of a Leyden library there lay a manuscript, to which attention was first called some twenty years ago, written in the low German dialect of Westphalia, and entitled the 'Chronicle of the Family of Love,' whose pages afford conclusive evidence of Plantin's connection with Nicolaes. The writer affirms that Plantin joined the society and affected a deep interest in its welfare, but used it merely as a stepping-stone to his own advancement. He proceeds to say, that Plantin printed the 'Mirror of Righteousness,' but that Nicolaes bore all the expense, even to the purchase of the types. At considerable length, and with references to Plantin's history which testify to the accuracy and minuteness of his information, he relates how Plantin disposed of the property of a Parisian jeweller which had been bequeathed to him as trustee for Nicolaes and his church, and roundly asserts that Plantin diverted to his own use some jewels which had been intended for the Family of Love or for its leader. Without accepting unreservedly the testimony of a hostile witness, it must be acknowledged that some of the most material of these statements have received the fullest corroboration. Microscopic investigation has established the identity

identity of the types from which the 'Mirror of Righteousness' was printed with those employed by Plantin in other works. Further confirmation has been obtained from a recent discovery of some legal documents bearing upon other details mentioned by the chronicler. Moreover, the period of Plantin's recommencement of his business at Antwerp on a greatly extended scale synchronizes very significantly with his inheritance of the precious jewels. At a later date Plantin joined another enthusiast named Barrefelt, who had also been a disciple of Nicolaes, but had left the community, and this desertion may account for the bitterness with which he is spoken of in the Chronicle. One additional item in proof of Plantin's affiliation with the Family of Love should not be omitted before we conclude this digression. Amongst the papers of the Musée, M. Rooses has discovered three letters which passed in 1567 between Plantin and Postel, whose entire subject is the doctrine, and whose style and contents are a reflex of the prolixity and mysticism which seem inseparable from the teaching of Nicolaes.

On the 28th of April, 1562, all Plantin's property was sold by official order, at the demand of two of his creditors, Louis de Somere and Corneille de Bomberghe. The stock of books in hand, printing machinery, household furniture,—everything except the family wearing apparel,—was put up to auction. The sale realized 1199 livres, a sum equivalent to about 2000*l.* sterling at the present day, and upon a settlement of his affairs it was found that there was a surplus to Plantin's credit of nearly the same amount. It should be noted that one of the petitioning creditors, Bomberghe, was a close personal friend and one of Plantin's partners in the firm, which recommenced the printing business in the following year. In truth, the whole affair was arranged by friendly hands to rescue Plantin's property from confiscation to the Government. We can estimate his peril from the promptitude and thoroughness of the measures employed to escape it. On no other grounds can we understand the sale of type and other material, which was re-purchased a twelvemonth later when the danger had passed, and Plantin could venture to return to Antwerp.

We must pass very rapidly over the next five years, during which Plantin superintended the issues of the reorganized firm as managing partner. It is not a little remarkable that, despite the peril he had so recently surmounted, all his four new associates were under suspicion of heresy, and were all related to one another: they were Corneille and Charles de Bomberghe, Goropius Becanus, and Jacques Schotti. The additional capital they

they brought into the business enabled Plantin to enlarge it so materially that more than two hundred works were sent forth in about four years—some of which were unsurpassed in beauty of type and execution by any of his later productions. At this moment the patriotic party was rapidly growing. Granvelle had left the Netherlands. The Duchess of Parma was in the utmost perplexity how to enforce the royal commands imposed upon her. Was it so doubtful at this critical period (1563–1567) which side would eventually prevail as to justify the risk of such an association: or did the image-breaking and the field-preaching, and the sack of Antwerp Cathedral, inspire some spirits like the Bomberghes to declare themselves in favour of the Reformed doctrines, whilst the excesses then committed filled quiet cautious men like Plantin with aversion and distrust? M. Rooses does not refer to the singular coincidence of political events with important transactions between Plantin and his associates. Already, before the close of the year 1566, Sir Thomas Gresham had given notice to the Court of Elizabeth that commerce would have no security at Antwerp ‘in these brabbling times.’ There was a great exodus of mercantile men, and, amongst others, the Bomberghes fled the country; Plantin, after considerable hesitation, decided to remain. The association, which was to have lasted until October 1st, 1567, was dissolved at an earlier date. On the 22nd of August, 1567, Alva arrived at Brussels, and eight days later Plantin wrote to Secretary Cayas in very earnest terms to purge himself from all complicity with the heresy of his former partners. He had never known Corneille’s sympathy with the Reformers until the period of the field-preaching, and as soon as he learned it he had forbidden him his house. He had dissolved his partnership, preferring a more limited trade and smaller profits to any connection with heretics. He had indeed once been under considerable pecuniary obligations to Bomberghe, but he had discharged them all, and had nothing more to do with him. He added further, with audacious cynicism, that the man was now utterly ruined through the bankruptcy of a large creditor, and through the loss of 8000 florins in maritime insurances. To the King’s confessor, Plantin insisted upon his orthodoxy in abject terms. He had never once been to the field-preaching. He had never missed Catholic sermon, or ceremony, or sacrament. The Jesuit fathers used his establishment more than any in Antwerp, and would bear witness to his unimpeachable fidelity to the Church and the Crown. The picture would be incomplete if we did not add that, ten years later, Plantin still owed the widow of Corneille 800 *livres*

de

de gros, and that Charles de Bomberghe, who subsequently played a prominent part on the patriotic side, figured in Plantin's accounts as a creditor, *under a disguised name*, as late as the year 1583.

The reason for this persistent assertion of his unimpeachable Catholicism is not far to seek. Plantin was hoping to carry out a project for which he had been making long and costly preparations. The Polyglott Bible of Cardinal Ximenes, published half a century before, had become exceedingly scarce, and Plantin had conceived the idea of reprinting it. Two Protestant versions of a like work were in contemplation, and one of them had secured the support of the Elector of Saxony. Nothing daunted, Plantin pushed on the work and brought a specimen sheet to the Lenten fair at Frankfort in 1566. The interest and admiration which the sight of it awakened were unbounded. The Elector abandoned competition with it in despair. The lords of Frankfort offered to subsidize the work, if Plantin would settle in their city and print it there. Similar invitations reached him from the Elector Palatine and the Constable of France. The thrifty Philip might hardly have been expected to accord equal favour to so costly an undertaking, had not Plantin been assured of the all-powerful advocacy of Cardinal Granvelle and Secretary Cayas. The former knew exactly how to make a suggestion so as best to find acceptance with the King, and the latter was no less skilful in fostering a half-formed inclination, and leading it to a definite and desired conclusion.

A letter to Cayas, under date December 19, 1566, in the archives of Simancas, contains the first known reference to the proposed Polyglott. It was to comprise the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek text—each with its Latin version—and was to fill six folio volumes. The cost of the paper would be at least 12,000 florins, and the wages for type-setting, printing, &c., as many more. What the other expenses would be for correction of the text, payment of scholars employed to superintend the proofs, compilation of a Hebrew dictionary, and other apparatus, could not be stated until the work was finished. Two years before, the learned Jean Isaac, Professor of Hebrew at Cologne, had been allowed by his superiors to visit Antwerp, that he might revise the Hebrew grammar of Pagnino, and had been maintained for nearly a year under Plantin's roof. Amongst others, he adds, 'I have met with a young man, very learned in Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, and Latin, to whom, the better to retain him, and to have him conveniently at hand, in the hope I entertain of eventually doing good service to the public, and

also

also through the favour in which I hold his scholarship and his rare virtues, I have promised my eldest daughter in marriage.' He had, besides, types ready cast of the most costly description, so that foreign printers from France, Germany, and Italy all acknowledged that his presses were unrivalled.

In a second letter, bearing the same date, Plantin enclosed a memorandum in more definite terms. If His Majesty would advance 6,000 or 8,000 crowns, he would undertake to print the Polyglott in His Majesty's name, and to preface it with a dedication, which would ascribe to the King all the credit of its publication. To the four languages already suggested, there would be added the Syriac version of the New Testament, which the late Emperor Ferdinand, of immortal memory, had caused to be printed at Vienna. He could give ample security for the royal loan. The Bishop of Ruremonde had promised 1,000 crowns, and wealthy Catholic merchants would assist in every possible way. As the price to purchasers should not exceed 20 ducats, the work would be extensively circulated, so that Philip would acquire, at a small cost, the most substantial reputation and everlasting renown.

From subsequent correspondence, we learn how deeply Plantin was concerned in the success of his gigantic enterprise. Evil days were gathering upon Antwerp, such as caused hosts of its commercial leaders to leave it; but Plantin held his ground, and kept together a body of compositors and workmen, whom he instructed how to work in Chaldee, Greek, and Hebrew. Under the pressure of the times, he was compelled to sell much of his stock to provide himself with ready money; but he would part with nothing which could help in carrying out his great design. Far from contracting his scheme, he kept enlarging its scope, and a revised edition of the '*Thesaurus Linguae Sanctæ*' of Pagnino, and soon afterwards a revised text of the Greek Testament, collated under Granville's auspices with the manuscripts in the Vatican, were embraced within his plan. In his anxiety to leave no available argument unemployed, he summons to his aid a most unexpected ally.

Among the most erratic spirits of this strange time was Guillaume Postel, a name of note in the early annals of the Parisian press. This man, who was alternately a favourite at Court, and a fugitive for heresy, had been the first person to introduce into Europe a copy of the Syriac New Testament, and he entertained singular notions of the results to be expected from the publication of the Polyglott. He was persuaded that it would effect the conversion of a vast number of Mahomedans and Jews; that it would reunite the scattered and divided members.

members of the Christian commonwealth; that it would further the union of the whole world in one flock and one fold, under one God, one law, one faith, one pastor, and one king; that it would lead to the establishment of an universal Empire, whose mild sceptre should be wielded by the beneficent hand of Philip II. of Spain. It is useless to enquire how Postel reconciled the frenzied dreams of a fifth monarchy man, with the sober stores of learning which he unquestionably possessed, and of which he could at times make profitable use. Without the key—if, indeed, there were any—wherewith to decipher his prolix and unintelligible letters, we are led to conclude that he was partially insane. But Plantin very skilfully quotes a letter he has just received from him—although he is held to be a fantastic visionary—which might perhaps tickle royal ears that are believed to have been specially accessible to this form of flattery.

The negotiations lingered through a whole twelvemonth, and Plantin feared that more pressing business arising from the anxieties of 'these brabbling times' would delay the completion of his Polyglott. His own resources were so sadly crippled by the heavy expenses he had incurred in purchasing a stock of costly paper, and retaining skilled workmen during the weary months of waiting for His Majesty's decision, that he had been compelled to sell a portion of the paper, and to employ the remainder in his edition of the 'Summa' of Aquinas. Yet he did not lose heart or relax his exertions. By March 1568, the Syriac version of the New Testament had been transcribed from the Syriac letter into Hebrew characters, *without the change of a single word*, and a literal Latin version of it completed, both from the pen of Guido Fabricius: wherefore he desires to go to press as soon as possible, that this Catholic Polyglott may see the light before one which is in preparation by a quidam Calvinist. At length, on his return from the spring fair at Frankfort, 1568, Plantin received a summons to wait immediately upon Alva at Brussels, and was then informed that a learned doctor would forthwith be sent from Spain to superintend the work, which was to be carried out at the King's cost. Six copies were to be printed on vellum for the royal libraries, and Plantin was to purchase the necessary parchment and all other requisites without delay. To his plea that he could not proceed without an advance of money, it was rejoined that he must set to work at once, and that his outlay would be repaid on the arrival of the aforesaid doctor.

The person selected to edit the new Polyglott was Benedictus Arias Montanus, the King's Confessor, and one of the royal chaplains.

chaplains. His learning and judgment had been conspicuous at the later sittings of the Council of Trent, to which he had accompanied the Bishop of Segovia, and where he had held a prominent rank among the professional theologians who helped to formulate the Council decisions. A better choice could not have been made. Spare in person, small in stature, with close dark beard, and the habit of a military knight of St. James—so abstemious that he touched neither meat nor wine, so indefatigable that he longed only for the solitude of unbroken labour—he was just the man to bring to the requisite stores of learning the minute and tedious accuracy which was demanded by his task. His mission was arranged with all the importance of a royal embassy. All the details of his embarkation and voyage, the reception to be accorded to him by the University of Louvain, the municipality of Antwerp, and the Viceroy himself—were carefully defined by Philip. His voyage was interrupted by a storm, which cast the vessel in which he sailed upon the west coast of Ireland, and he had to cross both that country and England before he could again embark for Antwerp, which he reached May 18, 1568.

At this moment Plantin had gone to Paris to purchase paper, but he hurried back to meet the welcome stranger. His anxieties, however, were not yet ended. Arias brought with him letters of credit from the Court of Spain, and a promise from Philip to contribute 12,000 florins to the work; but he required an undertaking from Plantin to repay three-quarters of the loan in copies of the Polyglott, and to give immediate security for the remainder. Compliance with this last condition was impossible. So universal was the feeling of insecurity and distrust, that 'a father would not even be responsible for his son.' After much discussion it was proposed that the proof-sheets, as they were printed, should be placed under the custody of Curiel, the royal factor, and Arias Montanus, and that, until the work was complete, Plantin's house, all his property, and his person should be pledged for whatever restitution the King should demand. Hard as were these conditions—for Plantin valued his printing establishment at more than 20,000 florins—they were not accepted without hesitation, and after special reference to the Spanish Court. Arias well knew the thrift of Philip. His own annual stipend as a royal chaplain was about 100*l.*, and this allowance was increased during his sojourn at Antwerp to a sum equivalent to 192*l.* a-year of our money.

The archives of the Musée Plantin supply minute details of the daily progress of the work. Five learned collaborateurs, besides
Raphelengien,

Raphelengien, his second self, worked under the direction of Arias. There were the texts of the different versions and their several Latin translations to be carefully revised. There were Hebrew, Syro-Chaldaean, Syriac, and Greek dictionaries and grammars to be compiled. There was a vast 'Apparatus Sacer' to be written. M. Rooses enumerates these amongst the principal additions made by Arias to the Complutensian Polyglott—besides which he added the Bible of Pagnino, the treatises in the last volume, the Syriac text of the New Testament and the Chaldee paraphrase for the whole of the Old Testament, which Ximenes had only given in his first volume. He also added the accents to the Hebrew texts. We are not giving a critical account of the work, but enough has been said to prove that the editor's labour must have been almost incredible. For four years he plied his task, Sundays not excepted, for eleven hours a day. His efforts were assiduously supported by Plantin. By the middle of May 1570 four presses were incessantly and exclusively devoted to the royal Polyglott, and a 'ternion,' and sometimes a sheet more, was struck off daily. 'Forty craftsmen were constantly at work,' says Arias, 'each in his own department, and no intelligent person passes through Antwerp without coming to see the order and activity which reign through the factory and the skill with which the work is carried on.' Universal interest was awakened in the success of so great an undertaking. Princes begged to have vellum copies, and Cardinals vied with one another in their efforts to render them complete. The theologians of Spain and the Netherlands proffered their manuscripts and their learning. Cardinal Spinoza, at Philip's elbow, stimulated his zeal in the cause. Cardinal Sirlet laboured to supply an exact text, and furnished various readings for the Psalms. Cardinal Granvelle's hearty co-operation has been already mentioned. He eagerly looked for the proof-sheets which were posted to him at Naples, as well as to his royal master at Madrid, as fast as they were printed. Despite such distinguished patronage, Plantin was almost crushed under the costs of his enterprise. In December 1569 he tells Granvelle that but for the sale of his Breviaries he would have been ruined by his outlay, which exceeded the value of all that he possessed. As time wore on, Philip became more exacting. He would allow no one to have a single vellum copy but himself, and he should require, not six, but thirteen. The Duke of Bavaria had bespoken and paid for one a year before, but Philip was inexorable. He was far less prompt in providing funds for his printer, who was distracted at the cost of 1600 dozen skins, for which

which Curiel supplied him with less than half the price. To complete his task Plantin became seriously involved in debt. By the time that the several versions of the text and the Bible of Pagnino were in the press, his resources were so exhausted that he could purchase no more parchment. The remaining volumes, comprising the 'Apparatus Sacer,' had all to be printed on paper, and the first edition limited to 600 copies, or less than half the number of the impressions of the text.

At length, after five years of unwearied labour and unceasing anxiety—from August 2, 1568, to August 18, 1573—the work was completed. Our space forbids more than a cursory description of its appearance and contents. The type, style and finish are magnificent. In the volumes of the Old Testament, each opening of two pages contains, in four parallel columns, the Hebrew text with Jerome's translation, the Greek Septuagint, and the Vulgate, and below them the Chaldee paraphrase and its Latin rendering. The New Testament comprises the Syriac, Greek, and Latin versions. Each book is headed by a preface from the pen of Arias Montanus, and by the prolegomena of Jerome. An abundance of engravings and maps increase the beauty and value of the edition. Besides various dictionaries and grammars the 'Apparatus' contains a vast mass of information, such as schedules of various readings, explanation of idiomatic phrases, brief annotations upon obscure passages. A series of treatises, distributed under ten fanciful titles, such as Nehemiah, Tubal Cain, &c., explains the geography of the sacred volume and the antiquities of the chosen people. A quaint peculiarity is the occasional occurrence of a brief admonition from the publisher to the reader, *printed on the title-page*, of which the following is a specimen:—

'Let him who would understand the arrangement and the full purport of this work, and of all things which are contained in this 'Apparatus,' read attentively the preface immediately following, as well as all the prefaces of the same Montanus annexed to the several books. No one will ever regret this truly insignificant labour.'

A similar preface to the book entitled 'Joseph, sive de arcano sermone,' states that it contains a clear explanation of more than eleven thousand passages, and if taken with the following section will form a continuous commentary upon the Scriptures. Needless to say that modern research has superseded much of the learning of Montanus. We may smile at the assertion, that the Hebrew of the Old Testament is the one primæval language, spoken by our first parents, of which God Himself was the author, and in which He delivered the Law on Mount Sinai.

This

This fact, it is added, is not merely established by unbroken tradition and admitted even by those who decry the Eastern languages (*apud ipsos linguarum detractores*), but proved by monuments left in the desert by Israel during the forty years' wandering. Despite all such imperfections, the work was, to the date of its appearance, an unparalleled achievement, such as entitles Plantin to the highest honour, and goes far to justify the hyperbole which declared Arias Montanus to be the wonder of his age.

The edition consisted of 1213 copies, of which 960 were on grand royal paper de Troyes, 200 on paper *au raisin* de Lyon, 30 on imperial paper à l'aigle, and 10 on grand imperial paper d'Italie. These last were not offered for sale, but were reserved as presents for distinguished persons, and Plantin assured the Duke of Bavaria that they even surpassed in beauty and splendour the copies on vellum. Of the 13 royal examples upon parchment, six were sent to the library of the Escorial, one was presented to the Pope, and another to the Duke of Savoy. The destination of a third has special interest for the English reader. The period of the publication of the Polyglott synchronizes with Alva's government of the Netherlands. While the best blood of the country was flowing like water; while the heads of Horn and Egmont were quivering on the scaffold; while the most odious and unrelenting cruelty was rampant, now unblushing in audacity, now veiled under the more hateful guise of unfathomable treachery, the proof-sheets of the gospel of the Prince of Peace and Love were passing to and fro between Antwerp and Madrid, it may be not infrequently by the same post which bore tidings to Philip of the work of the Blood Council, and carried back royal instructions or approval to his ruthless representative. What reward more fitting as a mark of royal favour to the terrible viceroy than a vellum copy of the royal Polyglott! We have been unable to trace its subsequent history. But amongst the choicest treasures of the British Museum, its pages as spotless, its very ink as brilliant as when it issued three centuries ago from Plantin's printing house, the visitor may gaze upon the splendid folios which Arias Montanus presented in his master's name to Alva, and may read that it was designed as an eternal monument of Alva's piety, 'from the best of monarchs to the best of ministers.'*

* The entire dedication runs as follows:—*Ex Philippi II. Catholici mandato Ill^{mo}. Albæ Duci Ferdinando, quod compositis in Belgia belli ac pacis reb. religione instaurata bonis artibus locum servavit. Benedict. Arias Montanus sacra causa legatum sanctum Bibliorum opus eadem tempestate felicissime executum. In eternum pietatis monumentum optimi regis optimo ministro detulit.*

Whilst

Whilst the latter portion of the Polyglott was yet in preparation, Philip despatched instructions to his ambassador at Rome to solicit the 'approbation and privilege' of the Pope. It was urged that the orthodoxy of the work was indisputable, that it was guaranteed by the censorship of Louvain and the imprimatur of the Sorbonne, that it was under the special patronage of the most Catholic king. To the dismay of all concerned in the work, Pius V. sternly refused. In vain did Zuñiga, the Spanish envoy, endeavour to obtain even the concession to Plantin of copyright within the Papal States. The impossibility of compliance was shown by a long list of reasons. First, the grant of copyright would tacitly imply approbation, and the Apostolic See could not approve what it had not seen. Second, there had been some change in the Latin version of the New Testament, which the Pope had not sanctioned, and which might be the work of Erasmus or some other novel interpreter. Third, the Pope did not know whether the Syriac text omitted the Apocalypse and the Second Epistle of St. Peter, whose authenticity was disputed by certain heretics. Fourth, it was necessary to examine whether some of the treatises were not cabalistic. Fifth, it was impossible to adopt without examination the modifications introduced into the translation of Pagnino. Sixth, it was said that the Talmud and other condemned books were quoted. Lastly, scandal was occasioned, in that Arias had invoked the aid of Masius, a scholar who only bore a doubtful reputation. So formidable an array of difficulties, however, was dissolved a few months later by the death of Pius and the election of the more accommodating Gregory XIII. The approbation of the Pope was speedily followed by that of the Catholic theologians of Germany and Spain.

During the progress of the royal Polyglott through the press, Plantin received a mark of the King's favour which he would gladly have been spared. The famous edict of 1550 had failed adequately to restrain heretical and seditious opinions, and it was determined to subject all who were engaged in the art of printing to severer scrutiny. By the first clause of an ordinance dated May 19, 1570, the office of royal 'prototypographus' was created, whose duty should be to carry out the minute and vexatious regulations which subsequent articles of the same edict prescribed. The foremost of these was to examine and approve all master and journeymen printers throughout the King's dominions in the Low Countries, and to furnish them with letters of 'identity,' according to their capacity; which letters were then to be presented to the sovereign or his lieutenant-general for confirmation, before they could practise their art.

Application to the prototypographus was not to be made until each master printer had obtained from his diocesan or from the inquisitor a first certificate of orthodoxy and good conduct, as well as a second one from the magistrate, testifying to his life and reputation. It was further enacted that he should swear true obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff, and acceptance of all the doctrines taught by the Holy Roman Church, as defined and declared by sacred canons and general councils, especially the Holy Synod of Trent. The same conditions were required of a journeyman before he could be admitted to a workshop. Yet this fourfold scrutiny of bishop and magistrate, prototypographus and viceroy, did not exhaust the paternal care of the Government. The new official was to have power to inspect printing houses, to test the capacity of 'correctors' and their acquaintance with the languages they professed to understand, to keep a register of all printers, with their names and those of their parents, the places of their business and their births, their mode of life, and 'the quality of their persons.' A supervision, no less microscopic, followed every issue from the press. The day and year of its commencement, and the date of its completion, were to be scrupulously recorded. As soon as the impression had been taken of a work, previously approved by the censors, a copy was to be furnished to the King's commissioners, that it might be carefully collated with the original manuscript. This ordeal surmounted, the work was to be submitted to the Governor-general or the Privy Council, who should decide on the advice of the prototypographus the reasonable price at which it should be sold, and which price was in every case to be specified on its first or last page. An extract from the Notarial Act, in Plantin's own hand-writing, authorizing one Jacques Boschart, of Douay, to exercise the *métier* of a printer, will cast additional light upon the execution of the ordinance:—

'He also has promised, and promises, to observe, point by point, the ordinances made, or hereafter to be made, by his Majesty on the subject of printing. Also, to print whatever he shall carry out, correctly, clearly, on serviceable paper with ample margins, and that he will not attempt to print anything in which he is not expert, under the penalty that what he has printed shall be priced only as waste paper, to be sold to the apothecaries and buttermen; and, moreover, if he should learn that anyone commits any abuse in the matter of printing, that he will warn him duly and in good faith to abandon it, in default whereof he will inform the magistrate, the prototypographus, or the visitors, as the case requires.'—'Correspondance,' vol. ii. pp. 146, 147.

It was in vain that Plantin endeavoured to decline the royal nomination

nomination to so invidious a position. He pleaded his imperfect knowledge of Flemish, and the overwhelming pressure of work occasioned by the Polyglott. He was more anxious, he said, for means to discharge his debts than to increase his dignities. He was peculiarly sensitive to ill-will, and had a superstitious dread of envy. Caution and conscience combined to make him deprecate any titular distinction. In reply to the congratulations and compliments of friends, he always expresses a wish to be regarded and addressed as a simple merchant and citizen; but he was constrained to accept the 'honours, rights, pre-eminences, franchises and liberties' assigned to his office. These high-sounding advantages resolved themselves into exemption from having soldiers billeted upon him, and a grant of land for an enlarged factory which he was never able to erect—a most inadequate return for a serious increase of labour and anxiety. After the troubles of the year 1576, the office became practically obsolete; but for three centuries the great Antwerp firm still employed as its address, 'Ex Architypographia Plantiniana.'

One of Plantin's earliest duties in his new office was the printing of 'Indices Prohibitory and Expurgatory,' which had been compiled by Arias Montanus, and were published by command of Alva. The annals of literature hardly contain a stranger chapter than that which narrates the history and vicissitudes of these singular catalogues, by which faithful members of the Roman obedience were to be guarded from contact with immoral and heretical authors. Ardent champions of Roman orthodoxy, saints vested in all the honours of canonization, infallible occupants of St. Peter's chair, even select inquisitors and compilers of indices, figure in the fatal lists side by side with heresiarchs ancient and modern, with doubtful philosophers and obscene poets. One of the earliest indices was the production of Della Casa, Archbishop of Benevento, whose own infamous poems were deservedly inserted in later editions of his own Index by express command of the same Pope, Paul IV., who had committed the censorship to Della Casa's hands. The commentaries of Arias Montanus himself did not escape proscription at a later date. It is not strange, therefore, to find some of Plantin's own publications included in the 'Index Prohibitorius' which he sent forth in 1570—notably the Psalms of Clement Marot, the stirring battle songs of the Huguenots.

The royal decree prefixed to the 'Index Expurgatorius,' and dated July 31, 1571, expresses a solicitude for the purses of his subjects, which contrasts curiously with the indifference of

Philip to their lives. It was a novel feature of the 'Index' that by Alva's decree, printed on the back of the title-page, no one but Plantin was permitted to print it, and that neither he nor any one else should sell or even possess a copy without episcopal permission: so that an author's writings might be mutilated or even altered so as utterly to misrepresent his meaning, without his being aware of the treatment to which his work was subjected. The bishops were to obtain the assistance of the booksellers to carry out the enjoined expurgation.

Here was a fresh burden laid upon the consciences and fears of booksellers, who, without communicating the contents of the Index to any one, were to occupy themselves in discovering, expunging, and restoring, the places marked for these purposes. The volumes surrendered for such manipulation must have presented a sorry appearance when objectionable passages had been excised by the shears or blotted out by the stamp, which was forbidden to spare even a passing complimentary epithet when applied to a heretic. How minute and circumstantial was the censorship of the Index may be gathered from the fact, that twenty-three pages are occupied with the writings of Erasmus alone. We have not space for further details. So carefully was the secret of this Index kept, that its existence was only accidentally revealed after it had been for fifteen years totally unknown. The three Indices published by Plantin are of extreme rarity, but they are all to be found on the shelves of the British Museum.

The publication of the royal Polyglott placed Plantin in the foremost rank of printers; but besides the high honour of such an achievement, it only brought enormous labour and considerable pecuniary loss. Before its completion, however, he was contemplating a new enterprise, which was destined to secure a princely fortune to his successors, and to be the means of preserving his establishment and its treasures to our own day.

One of the latest acts of the Council of Trent had been to commit to the Pope all questions relating to the Breviary and the Missal. It was alleged that the former had been mutilated and altered, and that certain bishops had introduced special breviaries into their dioceses. To remedy the confusion thus occasioned, all former *privileges*, with few exceptions, were revoked. A commission was appointed to recast the Breviary upon the most antique and approved model, and rigid uniformity in its use was to be enforced throughout the entire Roman communion. The work of revision commenced under Paul IV., and was not concluded until the pontificate of Pius V., who with characteristic promptitude ordered that the new Breviary should be adopted in Rome within a month, and within six months or

as soon as copies could be obtained in all regions beyond the Alps. The Papal brief further forbade the printing of the revised text without express authority. The copyright was granted to Paulus Manutius, the printer to the Papal Court. Two years later, a similar edict defined and ordained the publication of a new Missal, which was entrusted to Barthélemi Faletti.

It was obvious that the concession of exclusive copyright over any wide extent of country for books in such universal use would be likely to prove exceptionally profitable, and strenuous efforts were made by rival firms at Antwerp to secure so valuable a prize. Long negotiations followed, in which all the influence of Granvelle, now viceroy at Naples, and in high favour both with Philip and the Court of Rome, was exerted on Plantin's behalf. It is amusing to read the indignation with which Plantin treats the efforts to supplant him made by an *upstart* opponent, who had not only the audacity to advance pretensions to so important a task, but had secured powerful support in the Privy Council at Brussels. The Roman book-sellers were fully aware of the value of their monopoly, and Faletti demanded such a price as would have absorbed the entire profits of several years. When, after endless discussion and a wearisome course of intrigue and disappointment, satisfactory terms were agreed on, the engagements so painfully concluded were only maintained for a short period, and were then abruptly terminated.

For a new competitor had descended into the book market. Philip II. had importuned the Pope to permit certain modifications in the Breviary and Missal destined for Spain, and through the consent of his Holiness to this request, the copyright of the liturgical books to be used in the Peninsula had become the property of the Catholic king. Arias Montanus earnestly advised Philip to turn the concession thus obtained to profit. The printers of Rome and Venice, he urged, had netted huge returns from the Papal monopoly; would it not be better to retain so lucrative a business in his own hands, and to keep within his own dominions the vast sums of money which would otherwise be sent abroad in payment for the new service books? If so much were conceded, who could be so suitable an agent to carry out the work on the King's account as Christopher Plantin? His ability had been abundantly proved. He possessed stores of type, and had provided engravings of a high order, and all the other requisites for the adequate fulfilment of so important a task, so that the work could be done by him in royal fashion, and yet the profits would be greater by a third,

third, at the least, than if the task were committed to any other hands. Forthwith Philip entered into the details of the business with his wonted minuteness. In one royal despatch after another he enquired into the price per sheet of the various editions, and the quantities per month that can be supplied. It was eventually determined that the suggestion of Arias Montanus should be adopted, and that Villalba, another royal chaplain, should come to Antwerp and superintend the execution of the work.

It was in February 1571 that the King reviewed the protracted instructions drawn up by Villalba for Plantin's guidance. It was a critical, almost a desperate, moment in the history of the Spanish dominion over the Low Countries. The iron rule of Alva and the Blood Council had confessedly failed to subdue the national spirit, and the statecraft of Philip was strained to the utmost; yet amidst the absorbing intrigues, whose details embraced with plot and counterplot a thousand threads of policy in France, the Netherlands and Germany, in Italy and England, Philip found time to scrawl minute suggestions on the margin of Villalba's papers. No corrector for the press could have been more zealous in rectifying a clerical error, or be more concerned about the exact selection of a vignette or a coloured initial letter. For 'Magnifica beata mater et innupta'—as addressed to the Virgin—he proposed to read, 'Magnifica beata mater et intacta,' and to the words of the versicle, 'Domine fac Regem,' he would add 'nostrum'—especially as the phrase 'Oremus pro Papa nostro' was used—'since it might not be clear what king, but could not be doubtful what Pope, was prayed for.' Needless to say that the royal suggestions were adopted.

The first commission for the new Breviaries 'of four sorts' included an order for a hundred folio copies on vellum, and furnished with *cahiers* of the saints of Spain; fifty for the Order of St. Jerome, with the offices of the order; twelve for the Order of St. James, and the remainder for the Chapel Royal. It was found impossible to execute this splendid commission. It would have required 30,000 skins, costing at least 6000 florins, and the Royal Polyglott had almost exhausted the available supply. As soon as the arrangements for the Breviaries and Missals were settled, Plantin turned his attention to other and yet more important liturgical works. Once more Granvelle came to his assistance, and magnificent editions of the Psalter and the Antiphonaire, furnished with authentic music, and issued with the utmost luxury of paper, type, illustration, and musical notation, were rapidly followed by similar impres-

sions

sions of the 'Graduale Romanum,' the 'Offices de la Vierge' and 'Books of Hours.' Some of these were commenced on vellum; but the market was completely drained, and the concluding sheets had to be printed on paper. The splendour and finish of these service-books have never been surpassed.

From 1568 to 1575 extraordinary activity prevailed throughout Plantin's establishment. Contemporaneously with the Polyglott and liturgical books, or in rapid succession to them, he sent forth elaborate and portly folios in every branch of literature. Of these we can only quote a few of the more important examples. The department of theology was represented by massive editions of the 'Summa' and the 'Aurea Catena' of Aquinas, by the Commentaries of Arias Montanus and Serranus, by the Concordances of Bullocus; in jurisprudence, the works of Gratian, the 'Corpus Civile' of Charondas, the 'Pandectæ Juris Civilis,' the 'Institutiones' of Justinian; in science, the works of Dodoens, of De l'Ecluse and De Lobel; not to mention numerous issues of classical and miscellaneous authors. Some of these ventures were too gigantic to be undertaken exclusively at his own cost, or produced at presses already crowded with other work, and Plantin occasionally associated other printers with himself, or employed them to print on his account. Meanwhile projected editions of no less magnitude—such as the complete works of Augustine and Jerome—were in preparation. He soon gave further proof of his indefatigable industry by enrolling himself in the ranks of authors as compiler of a Flemish dictionary, accompanied by a Latin and French rendering of each word which it contained. The dictionary was an epoch in the history of the Flemish language. It secured a definite precedency for the dialect of Antwerp amongst the still unsettled provincialisms of the country, and firmly established it as the recognized national tongue of the Netherlands.

Yet amidst these absorbing activities clouds of misfortune were gathering around Plantin and Antwerp. The cruelties of Alva terrified and drove from the city in large numbers the merchants upon whom its prosperity was dependent, and the administration of Requesens failed to restore confidence or order. To the distractions of religious animosity were added the insecurity arising from the presence of bands of Spanish soldiery, whose pay was hopelessly in arrear, and whose pillage in the suburbs of Antwerp made all traffic impossible. On October 11, 1576, Plantin writes to Arias:—

'We hear of nothing but robberies, extortions, and murders of men, women, and children, and we are still only at the beginning of the war.'

war. Already all the roads are closed to commerce, and nothing comes into the city on the Flemish side. . . . Nearly all our soldiers have deserted their posts, under some pretext or other, and their places are taken by those who have been summoned to our succour against the Spaniards. Many persons are emigrating with their families and all their property. For myself, I no longer use a sheet of paper. I urge all those, with whom I have any influence, to remain. In fact, I trust that our good King and his ministers will not allow his loyal subjects to suffer troubles too heavy for them to bear. At present the people keeps quiet, obeys the magistrates, the government, the commandant of the troops, and the other authorities; and this makes me augur well for the future. The condition of our town has led me to abandon the idea of a public sale of my property, to free myself, at least in part, from debt and exorbitant interest; for no one will purchase anything. For the last two months I have only received enough to provide myself with wheat wherewith to make bread. Trust in God has never deserted me, I look to Him for safety and the life of men, for deliverance from these ills and true peace.'—Rooses, p. 296.

The horrors of the Spanish Fury fell upon the devoted city, and Plantin could only congratulate himself that, with the other members of his family, he escaped personal violence and outrage. Nine times over during those three terrible days he ransomed his property, and he affirmed that it would have been more profitable to have abandoned his house to pillage and fire. In the depth of winter he had to set out for Liège, and thence to Paris, that he might obtain money to repay the 2867 florins which Louis Perez had advanced. From Paris he went to the Lenten fair at Frankfort. Here he was again unable to meet his liabilities without a fresh loan of 9600 florins. It was his old partner, Charles de Bomberghe, who assisted him at this anxious crisis.

The varying fortunes of Antwerp during the next few years are faithfully reflected in Plantin's career. He became successively official printer to the States-General, to the Prince of Orange, to the Archduke Mathias of Austria, and to the Duke of Anjou. With adroit versatility, which the Vicar of Bray might have envied, he contrived to make his services valuable to all parties in turn. His style and title varied with the quality of the reigning authority. In 1579 the Mayor and Aldermen of Antwerp granted him a pension of 300 florins, and towards the close of the year the Prince of Orange, accompanied by his wife, paid a visit to his printing-house. Such favours could hardly be secured without being committed to action, which would seriously compromise him in the eyes of Philip, should Parma, who was pressing closely the siege of

Antwerp,

Antwerp, eventually triumph. Plantin's conduct at this juncture hardly accords with his characteristic prudence. He renewed his intimate relations with Barrefelt. He published works in defence of Protestantism, and in execration of Spanish cruelty. He might plead the necessity of his official position to extenuate his printing the official proclamations of a *de facto* government, even though it were in rebellion against the Spanish monarch, but it is astounding that he should have published pamphlets against Granvelle or in defence of heresy. He strove to disguise his personal connection with some of these publications by issuing them under the name of his son-in-law, Raphelengien. He endeavoured to escape detection by imposing an oath upon his workmen, to which they were obliged to put their signatures, in further assurance that they would not divulge the secrets of his printing-house. The energy with which he asserted in the correspondence that he maintained all the while with Arias Montanus, Secretary Cayas, and others at the Court of Spain, that he was acting under compulsion, and that he was still and ever had been the most devoted and loyal of Catholics, could hardly have satisfied the partizans of Spain. The special pleading was too palpable. Plantin, doubtless, was no traitor to Philip or to the Catholic cause; he was simply a dexterous tactician, who made the best possible terms for himself in circumstances of special difficulty, and who felt that his conduct required elaborate exculpation. We wonder with what patience Cayas read the windy metaphor by which (in October 1579) he veiled and defended his line of action. 'The storms which have gathered in the mountains have so swelled the torrents, that they carry all before them, and threaten not only to destroy the pastures and corn-fields, but to leave them strewn with so deep a deposit of sterile sand as shall make them permanently desert. It is hopeless to arrest their course directly. What will the wise engineer do under such conditions?' and he prolongs the well-worn simile through sentence after sentence of weary verbiage.

The motive for so many protestations and apologies is to be found in Plantin's hope of assistance from Philip in his pecuniary embarrassments. After repeated and fruitless application through others, he drew up a long and formal recitation of his 'griefs' against the Spanish King. He asserted that he had been induced by the King's agents to enlarge the type and paper of the Polyglott at a great increase of cost; that the royal grants, nominally supplied in payment for the parchment of the King's copies, had really been expended in books and manuscripts, purchased by Arias for the library of the Escorial; that

that the stipulated payments for the Spanish Missals and Breviaries had not been duly made, and that in partial liquidation of this contract a hundred copies of the Polyglott had been returned upon his hands at retail prices; that expenses incurred in the extension of his plans to supply the King's commands had been suddenly thrown upon him, and that definite instructions for a fresh series of publications, which were as suddenly countermanded, had involved him in ruinous losses. On these various items Plantin claimed over 23,000 florins, but he undertook to be content with whatever the King might be pleased to accord him. The state of his exchequer did not allow Philip to meet such demands upon his purse, and years afterwards Plantin's successors erased the royal debt as a hopelessly bad one from their ledger.

Yet never did the man's nobler qualities shine out more conspicuously than at this period. He faced his difficulties with a stout heart. At a heavy sacrifice he sold his business in Paris to satisfy some of his creditors; he worked with untiring energy to reduce the claims of others. He commenced and carried out enterprises before which, at such a season, the boldest might have quailed. The year after the Spanish Fury he published a magnificent edition of the works of St. Augustine, in ten volumes folio, revised by the doctors of Louvain. This edition held for a full century the foremost rank, and was only surpassed by that of the Benedictines. Two years later, Jerome's works followed. His exertions were continued with unflagging energy until Parma besieged Antwerp, when he retired to Leyden. On his return in 1585 he found the stately city but a shadow of its former splendour. Amidst the declining and fitful prosperity of its commerce Plantin passed the last four years of his life, sending forth, as opportunity offered, colossal publications. His last great work was the commencement of the 'Ecclesiastical Annals' of Baronius, of which the first volume was not issued until after his death, July 1st, 1589.

The picture afforded by Plantin's life and correspondence would be altogether imperfect without some glimpses of commercial and domestic life in the sixteenth century, which his papers reveal to us.

The portfolios of the Musée Plantin-Moretus cast abundant light upon the details of the three professions of printer, publisher, and bookseller, which Plantin followed simultaneously. Very few of the works which issued from his presses were printed at the expense of their authors; Plantin generally bore all the risk and monopolized all the profits. But if authors did not incur liability, they rarely enjoyed remuneration for their

their labour. When any payment was made, it was miserably inadequate. Only fourteen scholars, some of them of considerable celebrity, received more than ten florins for their works. The honorarium accorded to translators, editors, and annotators of foreign literature, was on the same meagre scale. There were expenses to which the publisher of the sixteenth century was liable; a page from Plantin's Journal of 1565 will illustrate their character and amount.

'On the 11th of March I was at Brussels on the business of obtaining certain copyrights, and to secure the favour of Monsieur the Chancellor and other powerful persons.' Then follows a detailed inventory of presents. 'To the Chancellor, 4 Auvergne cheeses, worth 15 patards each; 8 baskets of plums and pears, at 3½ patards each; and a Bible in 16mo, ruled and gilded.' The Curé of St. Gudule receives 2 cheeses and 6 baskets of fruit, and a Bible of the same description as before, and a like gratification is bestowed on Mons. Hopper. Some other laymen have to be content with creature-comforts only, on a carefully graduated scale. Then follow what appear to be fees for the visitation, approbation, and privilege of various works: the whole outlay amounting to the substantial sum of 50 florins.

The mutual relations of capital and labour did not greatly differ from those which prevail amongst ourselves. The master spirit of the establishment under Plantin was his son-in-law, Jean Moretus, and he presents his father-in-law with an amusing account of the trouble caused him by the workmen. 'They are as tiresome and ill-disposed as men can be. It seems they have learned from one another to *make Mondays*, and they will only work when they like. As to working well, it is only when you are at their elbow.' In 1575, Moretus wished to present Plantin, as a new year's offering, with a Typifce, as he terms a volume containing the title-pages and engravings which had been issued by the firm, and he naturally wanted to get it finished by the end of the year, but he failed, and why? 'Because these rascals of printers would play, when only a leaf or two was wanting to complete the work. If I ask the reason why they have not been at work, I have directly the most outrageous answers imaginable. One informs me that he has been to hear the first mass of a printer who has been made a Canon. Another, that he has been with the Dean of the Painters' Guild, to restore order amongst the book-binders; a third, that he went to see a calf's entrails buried, and so forth. So that I would as lief have to do with any pack of humbugs as with them.'

Twice a year—in Lent and autumn—Frankfort was the gathering ground of a vast concourse of merchants from every quarter,

quarter, and for nearly eighty years the firm of Plantin was represented at these fairs by its principals or their most confidential agents. In 1566, Plantin attended the Lenten fair, accompanied by his son-in-law, Jean Moretus. Plantin went by carriage from Antwerp to Cologne, and paid 4 florins 10 sous for his fare, and 3 florins in other expenses. Moretus *walked* the same distance—it is 150 miles—and spent 5 florins 15 sous on the road. During the fair their joint expenses amounted to 11 German florins, and the rent of their shop to 13 florins more. They returned by water to Cologne, and walked thence to Maastricht, whence they took the *voiture* to Antwerp. The entire cost of the Frankfort journey was about 57 florins, and this sum was more than doubled by adding to it the carriage of the bales of books, the export and import duties, the loading and landing charges, and *pourboires*. It should be added that despite his impending ruin in 1576, and the heavy sacrifices required to maintain his credit, he left a fortune equivalent to nearly 50,000*l*.

A few details of domestic life will serve to bring out Plantin's character into strong and favourable relief. In reply to enquiries from Cayas he writes that he has five daughters, having lost his only son in childhood, whom he has trained to fear God, the King, and his magistrates, and also to assist their mother in her household duties:—

'And because early childhood is too feeble in body for manual housework or business matters, I taught them at that time to write and read so well, that from the age of 4 or 5 years up to 12 years old, each of the four first, according to their age and position, has helped me to read the proofs from the printing-house, *in whatever language or writing it was sent to be printed*. And I have also taken pains at spare hours, and as leisure allowed, to have them taught to work with the needle upon linen, . . . with careful observation, by degrees, to what each one specially inclined.'

He proceeds to explain that Marguerite, the eldest, had displayed special capacity in writing, and had turned out one of the best pens in the country; but that weakness of sight had prevented her pursuing this accomplishment. She was given in marriage at eighteen years of age to Raphelengien, whose aid as a learned corrector of the press and coadjutor to Arias Montanus, was of singular value. The hand of the second daughter, Martine, was sought by Jean Moretus, 'a young man expert and well instructed in Greek, Latin, Spanish, Italian, French, German and Flemish.' 'Thus I possess two second selfs; the first in the printing-house, for correcting the press; the second in the shop, for my accounts and commerce.'

From

From another paper we learn the particulars of Marguerite's wedding. On the eve of the marriage, June 22, 1565, Plantin entered into a legal contract with his son-in-law to supply a *lit garni* as well as the bride's trousseau, and to defray the cost of the wedding feast. If any of the bridegroom's friends gave a wedding present, the young couple were to have the benefit of it; but if any of Plantin's friends showed a like generosity, the bride's father was to deal with it as he pleased. Raphelengien promised to continue in his father-in-law's service for three years, or until the edition of the Hebrew Bible was completed. Plantin, on his part, engaged to pay his son-in-law a salary of 100 florins a year, besides his household expenses, which were estimated at 60 florins more. Both parties undertook to give six months' notice before terminating the engagement. At the same time Plantin lent Raphelengien 33 florins, that he might 'make a good figure' on the occasion. Towards this amount $6\frac{1}{2}$ yards of cloth were set down at $17\frac{1}{2}$ florins, a hat at 1 florin, and more than 9 florins for the bride's rings, leaving $5\frac{1}{2}$ florins in ready money. The loan was repaid from the presents of Raphelengien's friends, which amounted to 32 florins 5 sous. Plantin's guests contributed no less than 90 florins $16\frac{1}{2}$ sous. Shortly before the event, the bride's father had purchased a piece of Lille gros grain for the bride's dress and his own robe, and a piece of Lille serge for the promised bed. We are not informed how many of Raphelengien's friends were present, but M. Rooses gives the names of twenty-eight citizens who were invited by the host, including the town clerk of Antwerp and the Bomberghes and Schotti, his trade partners in 1568. The menu of the wedding feast was sufficiently substantial. It comprises 3 sucking-pigs, 6 capons, 12 pigeons, 12 quails, 5 legs of mutton and 3 more *en brune pâte*, 12 sweetbreads, 3 tongues, 6 veal pies and 6 hams. Besides these there were served cherries, guignes, strawberries, oranges, capers, olives, salad and radishes. The confectionery included masspains, sugar-plums, aniseed, and Milanese cheese. Wine was consumed to the value of 12 florins 5 sous for Rhenish, and 4 florins $2\frac{1}{2}$ sous for red wine, without reckoning 7 florins for a 'pot de vin' given to the workmen. The festivities were prolonged for several days, and even on June 30 money was being taken from the till for the wedding expenses.

Raphelengien remained for ten years under Plantin's roof, and so valuable were his services, that his annual stipend was increased on several occasions until, in 1581, it stood at 400 florins. How simply a man with so ample an income was satisfied to lodge is curiously revealed in a petition from Plantin to the municipal

municipal authorities, for exemption from having soldiers billeted upon him at a house which he held in the Rue du Faucon. 'The place,' he says, 'is used as a warehouse, and never has any empty space in it for three days together, except a small low sleeping closet, about 12 feet wide by 16 feet long. This contains two beds, which fill almost the entire chamber, in which there sleep my son-in-law Raphelengien, with his wife and three of their children, and their chambermaid.' This was in 1575; A few months later Plantin conveyed to Raphelengien for 300 florins one of the small dwellings which, until a few years ago, disfigured so picturesquely the western front of Antwerp Cathedral.

Catharine, the third daughter, was hardly as fortunate as her elder sisters. She went to live with her husband, Jean Gassen, in the family of his uncle at Paris, and shortly afterwards her father was grieved to learn that the young couple did not comport themselves to the satisfaction of their host. Forthwith he addressed each of them in letters of appalling length. It appears that Catharine had carried her audacity to the pitch of refusing to fulfil the duties of a chambermaid, on the plea that there were plenty of servants to do the work without her; and her father has the most vehement distress of heart to hear of behaviour so entirely contrary to the will of God, his own wishes, and the proper order of things. He tells her with unsparing candour, that despite an apparently cheerful and cordial manner, he knows that she is only too disposed to imagine that she ought to be listened to, and that she should have authority to talk, chatter, babble, and even upbraid, as is the detestable custom of too many.

'I would remind you that as long as I could possibly do so, I used to arise betimes and to employ myself at anything, without setting myself above any one, and I never thought myself of any other degree than the very least of my servants or chamber women. Neither you nor your husband are made of different flesh from the most abject people in the world. Nor is she even to think herself the equal of the daughters of the house, who are under their father's roof and heiresses of his estate.'

And so the merciless pen runs on through nine long pages of printed matter. It is not a little remarkable that throughout these letters there is not a single reference to confession or priestly counsel, to Virgin or saints, or any other means of grace which the Roman Church would commend.

- ART. VIII.—1. *History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815.* By Spencer Walpole. Vols. III.—V. London, 1880—1886.
2. *The Greville Memoirs* (Second Part). *A Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852.* By the late Charles C. F. Greville Esq., Clerk of the Council. 3 vols. London, 1885.
3. *The Greville Memoirs* (Third Part), 1852—1860. 2 vols. London, 1887.

MR. WALPOLE'S 'History of England' is an unsatisfactory book, notwithstanding the diligence, and, we gladly add, the ability of the author. It contains not only passages, but chapters of considerable merit, yet were we to recommend it to our readers as being what it professes to be, a History of England during a great portion of the present century, we should be parties to the extraordinary delusion under which Mr. Walpole seems to labour, that a dissertation on certain ethical tendencies is history in the proper sense of the word. 'Histories,' said Bacon, 'make men wise,' and we are willing to believe that there is much wisdom to be found in the volumes of Mr. Walpole, but we are not therefore convinced that they are history as Bacon understood the term, or as the reader of Mr. Walpole's title-page would understand it now. History in the highest sense, in which alone it is rightly connected with the name of a country, is the story of the nation's fortunes, the narrative of its political acts, delineating the qualities and the temperaments of the men who have contributed to guide the social organization. The career and characters of those who for good or ill have been at the head of public affairs during the period treated of must be the main theme. The writer should tell us how many of the events which occurred were due to individual idiosyncrasies, how many to national characteristics, to accidents of local and material condition; how far mental habits and waves of thought affected the persons who governed and the nation which they ruled; what lessons we may gather for the formation of political character, for the conduct of public affairs in analogous circumstances. Bacon, we imagine, would have found some other name for Mr. Walpole's volumes than a History of England. 'An Enquiry into the national growth of Moral Sentiment,' 'A History of the Influence of Philanthropy in English Politics,' 'An Examination of the Social and Economic Condition of England in the Nineteenth Century'—any of these would have been better titles than that which Mr. Walpole has selected, one which is not fair to himself

self or to his readers. The politics of Aristotle abound in illustrations from history. Adam Smith's 'Wealth of Nations' is a treasury of historical knowledge concerning England, Holland, and the States of America, but we should not think of calling Aristotle's book a history of the Hellenic Communities, nor Adam Smith's a history of the nations on either side of the Atlantic.

Mr. Walpole appeals to the example of Mr. Lecky, whose last work is named a history of England during the eighteenth century. Mr. Lecky, however, expressly warns us that his volumes are concerned with certain lines of investigation, that for events and politics his readers must go to the works of Lord Stanhope; but so far from profiting by Mr. Lecky's example, and modestly referring us to Alison or Martineau, or to Mr. Justin McCarthy, for the incidents of the times he was about to discourse on, Mr. Walpole claims comparison with Macaulay. In his preface to his earlier volumes he justifies his purpose of writing on events in which living people have taken part, by telling us that Macaulay 'contemplated as a final halting-place the Reform Bill of 1832. If it were legitimate in 1848 to contemplate writing the history of 1832, it must be legitimate in 1878 to contemplate writing the history of 1862.' However that may be, the reader will find little in these volumes to remind him of Lord Macaulay. Although Lord Macaulay's history abounds in disquisitions on the habits and manners of the age, we never lose sight of the main business of the work, the course of political thought and action.

Mr. Walpole endeavours to anticipate some of the objections which may be taken to his method. 'History may, undoubtedly, be written in two ways. The historian may, on the one hand, relate every event in the history of a nation in strict chronological order. He may, on the other hand, endeavour to deal with each subject as a separate episode.' Our contention is, that Mr. Walpole has fulfilled neither of these conditions. It is not the order in which he gives us history, nor the particular light in which he presents it, that we object to. What we complain of is, that the great political occurrences of the time do not stand out as the chief portion of his work. They may be traced by a diligent student, but the reader who does not look for them would hardly find them. There are regular summaries of political facts, changes of Ministries, and so forth, but these read more like abridgments of the Annual Register than the result of thought applied in a comprehensive spirit to a long sequence of events. The brief annals found in these volumes have not been illustrated by the author's labours. They bear no distinct relation to the main body of the work.

Perhaps

Perhaps the best example of the intellectual equipment with which he sets about the task of writing the history of the age he lives in, is a passage in his third volume, in which he apologizes for introducing some notice of foreign politics, and of Lord Palmerston. That famous Minister, he tells us, at one time 'won the approval of earnest Liberals.' 'Earnest Liberal,' our readers know, is the description of a man who likes to be thought superior to his neighbours, and has not the courage to call himself a Radical. This is the kind of person who is the author's counsellor in foreign politics. In his recent volumes foreign politics are less noticed, but the disposition to decry Lord Palmerston is strong as ever. That Minister is, however, more fortunate than Sir Robert Peel, whom Mr. Walpole has taken under his protection. Sir Robert Peel's pre-eminent ability needed no recognition. The author might have attempted some clear explanation of the passages in Sir Robert Peel's career which suggest a want of foresight or a craving for power, or he might have told us that we must wait for any definite judgment until the public have the result of some examination of the voluminous papers confided to the late Lord Cardwell. Instead of choosing some definite course upon the most interesting problem of the time he had to deal with, we have a number of isolated reflections, echoes of other people.

The second work mentioned at the head of this article is as different in conception from the volumes of Mr. Walpole as it is superior in execution. Mr. Greville's *Journal*, Sir Theodore Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*, and Mr. Croker's *Correspondence and Diaries*, will probably always remain invaluable records of contemporary history for the period they cover. The second and third parts of the *Journal* deal with very nearly the same time included in the fourth and fifth volumes of Mr. Walpole, and it is in Mr. Greville's pages that we become fully conscious how inadequate are the labours of Mr. Walpole. Greville was a partisan, he was intimately associated with the party whose prolonged decline is one of the chief characteristics of this period; and the later volumes reflect the dissatisfaction of men who held office with perfect confidence that they were indispensable to their country's good, but felt their control over events growing weaker each year. Familiar association with the leading men of the Whig party, and with several of the most distinguished Tories, gave Mr. Greville many opportunities of observation, and these his own acuteness and fine taste enabled him to use to great advantage. If we make due allowance for his fuller knowledge of one set, namely the Whig party, no better contem-

porary record can be found of the first Victorian generation. Cabinet rank was still connected with the great landowning interest; Cabinet Ministers were in the first place looked for among peers or the connections of peers. The constitutional right of the Crown to choose its own Ministers was recognized as extending to the exclusion of this person or that from a particular Cabinet. This was a time when men like the Duke of Bedford and Lord Lansdowne on one side, like Lord Salisbury and Lord Lonsdale on the other, decided on the possibility or permanence of Cabinets, although the part they actually took in public discussions was comparatively slight.

The social interests of Greville's journal we do not propose to examine within the limits of this paper. What we are concerned with is to see how far his volumes and those of Walpole help us to apprehend the complex series of events running from the fall of the Whig party under Melbourne to the supremacy of Lord Palmerston in 1856.

The opposition to the Tory government in 1830 included, with the remnant of the old Whig party of Grenville, who advocated not democratic revolution, but a gradual making room within the existing system for the new social elements, the group of men who formed the modern Whig party of the last generation, and of whom we have an admirable picture in the Journals of Mr. Greville. Men of ancient family and great social position, they lived in the echo of the noble phrases by which the great Whigs from Somers to Burke had made the ideal of popular liberty intelligible and attractive. They had no particular principles, no beliefs except that the Whigs were the proper rulers of the country. With the old principle of Reform of Parliament they had little sympathy, but they followed Lord Grey, who was unyielding on that subject, and Lord John Russell, who belonged to the new party, but was Grey's faithful adherent on Reform.

When certain of the existing boroughs were successively disfranchised, and the proposals to transfer the seats to new commercial towns, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham, were rejected, it was plain that the modified Liberalism of the Revolution and of Burke was doomed. Democracy was the only alternative, and democracy was only a question of time. After the death of George IV., and the French Revolution which followed, the Radical reaction burst forth. Then the Whigs, led by Grey and Russell, carried the Reform Bill, and the new structure implied nearly all the changes which we have witnessed down to the present day. The old diversities of franchise were swept away, with the exception of the distinction
between

between county and borough voters. Both in counties and in boroughs a new principle was adopted, the acquisition of electoral power by a definite property qualification, a test which with the diffusion of wealth would necessarily vary in subsequent years. The broad level of democracy appeared in the distant future, but the nation was not yet called upon to traverse it.

The new middle class, who got votes in 1832, were not the Government, nor before 1847 were they even a very important part of the supporters of the Government in Parliament. They did not claim a share in administration until a much later period. The country, when the Tories were not in office, was ruled by the traditional Whig party. It was the struggle on the Corn Laws which gave the new classes political weight and organization. It was only after the death of Palmerston that they were represented in office. Without full notice of this process, and of the gradual surging into the Liberal organization of the great middle class with their new-found wealth, their experience and intellectual acquirements, qualified by locality and by various schools of Dissenting opinion, the history of the Liberal Administrations from 1834 to 1852 is a hopeless entanglement. The Ministry of Lord Grey had definite work to do, and it was done brilliantly. Stanley and Graham were lost to the party before the reaction against the triumph of reform had fairly set in. The personal popularity of Althorp stemmed the downward current for a time, but the withdrawal from office of Grey and of Brougham practically left the party, which had triumphed so signally in 1830-1832, without any leader of commanding weight.

Mr. Walpole endeavours to explain the decline of the Whig party under Melbourne, by the action of the House of Lords, who rejected many proposals of the Government. But the Liberal leaders were not deserted because they were unsuccessful, but because the public had no confidence in their statesmanship, and little interest in their schemes. When the large measures, on which public opinion had decided, were carried by the Grey Administration, and the country saw with chagrin that the men who had succeeded Grey and his colleagues had no particular principles and no special abilities, they naturally turned to the man whose powers and experience were universally recognized, Sir Robert Peel.

The Tamworth manifesto had shown the world that Peel was no reactionary. He adopted the new conditions of public life, and at the head of the Conservative party entered into competition with the enfeebled Whigs for the conduct of administration. The election of 1837 on the Queen's accession did not give a

Tory majority, but it clearly proved that the Liberal party were losing their hold on the country, and in Parliament the Government suffered defeat after defeat. The condition of the finances was deplorable, the distress in the country wide-spread. Palmerston was the only success the Ministry could boast of, but his popularity in foreign affairs did not counterbalance the failures of his colleagues. In 1838, Mr. Greville writes:—

‘Peel has worried and mauled them sadly, and taken a tone of superiority, and displayed a real superiority, which is very pernicious to a government, as it tends to deprive them of the respect and confidence of the country. Brougham’s harangues in the House of Lords have not done them half the mischief that Peel’s speeches have done in the House of Commons because Peel has a vast moral weight and Brougham has none. . . . There is no doubt that the Tories have put themselves in a better position for getting office, and the Whigs in a worse for keeping it, than they were before, because impartial men who look at these debates will say that Peel and his people are the abler practical men, and as time settles the great questions in dispute, and renders the public mind more indifferent about those which remain, there will be a growing opinion that the direction of affairs ought to be entrusted to those who display the greatest capacity to conduct them.’—‘Greville Memoirs’ (Second Part), vol. i. p. 55.

The growth of opinion in favour of Peel continued steadily down to the election of 1841, when it bore fruit in a great majority, and Lord Melbourne’s discreditable struggle to hold office was finally terminated. Greville, writing in the July of that year, sums up the misdeeds of the fallen Whigs with all the frankness of an old friend.

‘They richly deserve the fate that has overtaken them, for their conduct has been weak and disgraceful, and as no Ministry ever enjoyed less consideration while they held power, so none will ever have been more ignominiously driven from it. They have tenaciously clung to office, and shown a disposition to hold it upon any terms rather than give it up; and when at last they have made a formal appeal to the country, and demanded of public opinion whether they should stay or go, they have been contemptuously and positively bid to go. They have done their utmost to make the Queen the ostensible head of their party, to identify her with them and their measures, and they have caused the Crown to be placed in that humiliating condition which Melbourne so justly deprecated when the question was first mooted. In no political transaction that has ever come under my notice have I seen less principle and more passion, selfishness, absence of public spirit, and less consideration for the national weal. Rage for power, party zeal, and hatred of their antagonists, have been conspicuous in the whole course of their language and conduct.’—‘Greville Memoirs’ (Second Part), vol. ii. p. 22.

Peel

Peel entered office not as the champion of Protection, for this was not the question at the election with either party, but as the ablest man in public life, the statesman most likely to be in a position to form a stable government with a coherent majority. He could boast the support of all the eminent men whose popularity survived, with the single exception of Palmerston. With the great veterans of the Tory party, Wellington and Lyndhurst, were united a number of distinguished orators and administrators; and in the Cabinet were two of the ablest of the public men who had helped Lord Grey to carry his Reform Bill, Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham. Peel in 1841 was the representative of economy and efficiency in administration, of good government and Conservative interests, and he gathered round him a number of men, who even after Peel's death exercised direct influence in politics by the spell of his renown.

The character of this great statesman will always be the most interesting study in this period. Mr. Greville gives us an excellent summary of his public life, but does not claim any special knowledge of the man. 'My acquaintance with Peel, he tells us, 'was slight and superficial.' His abilities, his steadfastness, his determination, the dignity of his political conceptions, are admitted by all men; but Mr. Walpole does not help us to explain why he never won a victory that was not followed by a still more signal defeat; why, during his whole career, he continued to forfeit the confidence of one set after another of his enthusiastic supporters. Mr. John Morley's description of him as a man 'of furtive intellect' is not very light-giving, but it shows that the writer is conscious of the enigma Peel's career presents; that he knows it cannot be explained by the popular Liberal theory of Peel as the good citizen garotted by Lord Beaconsfield in the dark ages of the second Parliament of Queen Victoria. In seven pages Mr. Walpole discourses of the character of the man, whose career during some forty-five years he has been relating to us without giving us any distinct idea of the statesman, or any confidence that the writer has got a clear impression himself. 'If his worth,' we are told after the manner of an epitaph of the last century, 'has not appeared in this work and in this volume, it will not be illustrated by a few general remarks on his defects or his virtues.' The reader of history does not always expect a collection of worthies; what he wants is, to be able to feel as if he knew the men who played a part in past times; if he cannot discern the springs of action which shaped their career, to be conscious of the habits and manners and presence which affected their dealings with their contemporaries. This is the help the reader gets from

from Macaulay's account of Lord Halifax, or, to come to living writers, from the Belisarius of Mr. Hodgkin, or the Lord Stratford de Redcliffe of Mr. Kinglake. We learn that,

'Shy and even awkward in society, he had not the inclination, and he did not court the opportunity, to conciliate or educate his followers in unofficial hours. Impatient of contradiction, and hasty in his temper, he could not win support in public by an encouraging smile or a conciliatory word; and so, though his capacity gained him confidence and his character respect, beyond the narrow circle of his own associates he won no man's affection.

'His failure to attract sympathy was due to the severity of his manners and not to the coldness of his heart.'—Walpole, iv. p. 376.

After many similar observations Mr. Walpole concludes: 'He inherited his earlier opinions: he thought out, for himself, his later conclusions. It would thus be as reasonable to blame Luther for commencing his career as a Roman Catholic as to blame Peel for commencing his career as a Tory.' This comparison of the fervent storm-swept genius of Luther with the cold clear intellect, which so long presided over the Tory party, is in itself enough to show how feeble is Mr. Walpole's grasp of his subject.

We cannot help thinking that the great source of Peel's misfortunes, for misfortunes they undoubtedly were, was not the indifference to principle nor the reckless love of power which his enemies ascribed to him, but a total want of any generous sympathy with other men. His reserve towards his colleagues cannot be explained by any impatient sense of intellectual achievement, for his mind confessedly worked slowly. His was not a soaring genius that would look down with disdain on those who toiled painfully after him. His laborious acquisitions of political thought, consummate as they were, he had no inclination to share with any one. Sir James Graham came nearer being his confidant than perhaps any other man, and Graham's was a nature even more suspicious and distrustful than Peel's. This characteristic of Peel is not one which we can explain as due to early education or faults of manner.

Sir James Graham is one of the most important figures in the great political drama of the Victorian period. With administrative abilities hardly surpassed by Peel, great knowledge, and official experience, he attained all but the highest rank in politics. As a critic and debater he excelled most of his contemporaries; but, in a somewhat different way, he had much of Peel's unsympathetic character. Admirable as are the cogency and calm vigour of his speeches, we can understand the saying, which Bishop Wilberforce records of Lord Aber-

deen,

deen, 'Graham always provokes some one when he speaks.' His knowledge of human weakness predisposed him to intrigue with an opponent, rather than to persuade him, and, failing success in intrigue, to rely upon his own right arm for crushing him. His ambition continually prompted him to enterprises which the cold fit of criticism and distrust prevented him from carrying out.

In the Ministry of 1841, not in the Cabinet, but representing in the House of Commons what was in the circumstances of the times one of the most important departments of State, the Board of Trade, was a young champion of Ultra-Toryism, Mr. Gladstone. Unfortunately there was one remarkable omission. Peel passed by with cold civility the attentions which another Tory aspirant paid him, and Mr. Disraeli, who though junior to Gladstone in Parliament, had already taken a conspicuous part in politics, was left without any post in the Government. This neglect of a man of Disraeli's abilities may be explained in various ways. It cannot be ascribed to any jealousy, any instinctive prescience that in the member for Shrewsbury was his future executioner. In the first place, all the evidence we have shows that Disraeli courted Peel with some diligence, and that the great leader received this homage with satisfaction. It was the misfortunes of Peel's policy, which five years afterwards gave Disraeli an opportunity for proving his strength. Nor was his hostility declared for some Sessions. It is an indication of the defect we have already pointed to, his want of sympathy with the intellectual work of other men, that in forming his Ministry in 1841 he did not see the advantage of securing the help of Disraeli. His judgment must have convinced him of Disraeli's powers; but, secure in his egotism, he indulged his natural dislike of Disraeli's temperament; and this spirit of cold repulsion, which afterwards forfeited the co-operation of Stanley, was no doubt strengthened by his alliance with Graham.

It is easy to perceive how a man of Graham's capable, powerful, but somewhat stolid nature, would regard such an aspirant as Disraeli, and we know from the Peel Memoirs that Graham was, from the commencement of the Ministry, Peel's chief adviser. Writing to Mr. Croker in 1843, of the possible dissentients in the party, Graham says, 'Disraeli alone is mischievous, and with him I have no desire to keep terms. It would be better for the party if he were driven into the ranks of our open enemies.'* It is curious to note that, at this time,

* 'The Croker Papers,' vol. iii. p. 9.

Graham had not been so many years a member of 'the party;' and in a still less number of years it was not Disraeli, but Graham and his leader, who had to leave the Tory ranks.

The story of this great Administration may be briefly told. By the Budget of 1842, Peel established a reduced duty on corn, redeeming the only pledge he had given on the Corn Laws, that he would deal with them by adopting a sliding scale, and not a fixed duty as Lord John Russell had proposed. By other adjustments of the tariff, many of them in the direction of Free-trade, by the imposition of an income-tax, and by reduction of expenditure, he provided for the accumulated deficit of ten millions left by the Whigs and obtained a surplus. His financial success continued up to the autumn of 1845. Mr. Walpole's account of the Budget of 1842 is well done. It is always pleasant to find him discussing questions of finance or giving statements of figures. His lucidity and logical sequence in presenting masses of figures and the result of tabular returns make us regret that he has not chosen the financial or economic history of these times as the subject of his labours, rather than the larger and more ambitious theme he has selected. Unfortunately, when he comes to general statements, his disposition to improve the occasion for the advancement of Liberal ideas makes him altogether untrustworthy. The history of the Anti-Corn Law agitation is so well known, that we could hardly suppose it possible to make any serious mistakes on the subject. Yet this is the language in which Mr. Walpole introduces his account of Peel's Corn Law proposals:—

'It is difficult to understand how reflecting persons could venture on defending the miserable legislation which was originated in 1815. Based on selfishness, it had resulted in failure. The country gentlemen, bent on maintaining rents by sustaining the price of corn, had persuaded a pliant Minister to prohibit the importation of wheat when its price was below 80s. a quarter. They were good enough to allow that 4*l.* a quarter was a remunerative price, and they thought that they had secured this price for ever by enacting this monstrous law.'—Walpole, *iv.* p. 60.

Mr. Walpole cannot plead ignorance as an excuse for this absolutely misleading statement, for in his first volume he gives a good summary of corn-law legislation, showing that protective legislation in regard to corn was as old as the days of the Henries and the Edwards. The legislation of 1815 was only a readjustment, after a long period of war, of old and well-recognized principles. The suggestion that the struggle of the Anti-Corn Law League was to abolish a modern innovation, created by the reckless selfishness of the Tories who followed

Lord

Lord Liverpool, is the strongest example we have yet seen of that mode of preparing facts for popular consumption which Mr. Gladstone once denounced as one of the dangerous consequences of a democratic era.

In the autumn of 1845 came the potato famine, destroying an article of food of great importance in England, and of prime necessity in Ireland. So absolute was the failure in that part of the kingdom that the operation of the sliding scale was impracticable. An immediate supply of food was the urgent requirement. It was impossible to wait for nice adjustments of duty to come into operation. When Peel's sense of the difficulties was disclosed to his colleagues at the end of November, all the Cabinet except Graham and Sidney Herbert opposed his proposals. It is too often assumed that his making Free-trade proposals to his colleagues was a betrayal of the people who trusted him in 1841. A careful examination of the facts does not justify this opinion, nor do we believe that it would ever have been formed, if Peel had had the habit of acting with frankness and directness of demeanour towards his followers. It is true that Lord John Russell, when the Budget of 1841 was under discussion, announced that the duty on corn was to be further considered; but this announcement, so far from being taken as a declaration that the Whig Government were in favour of Free-trade, was treated as an additional proof of the depth of degradation to which the Ministry had fallen. They were ready to hold out a flag which might stimulate the hopes and attract the votes of the new party, the Anti-Corn Law agitators, although neither in the House of Commons, nor at the hustings did they venture to identify themselves with the cry of Free-trade.

Peel soon found that his majority differed from him widely, and he resigned, recommending the Queen to send for Lord John Russell. That agile politician had already a month before, in his letter to the electors of Edinburgh, announced his sudden conversion to Free-trade; and with his usual confidence he set about the formation of a Cabinet. He relinquished his task on the pretext * that the second Lord Grey refused to join, if Lord Palmerston was Foreign Secretary; and Peel resumed office, securing the co-operation of the Duke of Wellington. Stanley persisted in his resignation, and Gladstone, who had quitted office a few months before on the Maynooth

* We say the *pretext*, because we agree with a well-informed writer in the first number of the 'English Historical Review,' that Lord John Russell 'seized the opportunity unexpectedly afforded him of abandoning a hopeless task.' All the letters which passed between Lord Grey and Lord John Russell on that occasion are given in that periodical.

Grant, accepted Peel's invitation to enter the Cabinet as Secretary for the Colonies.

We are not disposed to question the good faith with which Sir Robert Peel, in duty to the Queen and to the country, whose interests he believed involved in passing a measure of Free-trade, returned to take up the unpleasant task of carrying his new scheme in the teeth of his own supporters. That he should have done this with any hope of being forgiven, of reconciling them to do justice to his motives, is to attribute to him an ignorance of human nature inconsistent with his intellectual powers; nor does it seem likely that he ever contemplated taking the leadership of the Liberal party. It is difficult to believe that a man of his judgment was not aware how many years must elapse before any necessities of politics could overcome the hatred of the men who thought, in all honesty, that they had been deceived with deliberate calculation, and betrayed in cold blood.

Whatever may have been his plans in the winter, when Parliament met in 1846 he declared simply for Free-trade. The lawlessness of Ireland meanwhile had, with the increase of distress, become intolerable, and during the spring a stringent measure of repression was announced. It has never been fully explained why this measure, for which urgency was at one time claimed, was not pressed forward. By accident or for some reason not disclosed the Corn Law scheme was allowed to take precedence of it. It was known that the Whigs, who counted on the Irish vote for their chance of returning to office, would oppose it. The Tories, on the other hand, were bound to support it, unless they went the length of saying that any statements made by the Ministry were utterly unworthy of credit. As long as the Corn Bill was under discussion, the temptation to them to take this line was enormous. After the Bill was passed there might perhaps be some doubt, whether from mere desire for vengeance they would push matters so far with the certainty of restoring the Whigs to office. However that may be, the second reading of the Irish Bill only came to a division the night that the Corn Bill passed the Lords. The delay in bringing it on was urged on all sides as a proof that no necessity existed for it, and the Government was in a minority of seventy-three by a combination of Whigs, O'Connellites, and Tories. Greville sums up the result of this crisis in terms of judicial impartiality towards Peel and his assailants:—

‘He has been bitterly accused of deceiving and betraying his party, of “close designs and crooked counsels,” and there is no term of reproach and invective which rage and fear, mortification and resentment,

ment, have not heaped upon him. He has been unjustly reviled; but, on the other hand, it must be acknowledged that, wise as his views, and pure as his motives may have been, his manner of dealing with his party in reference to the changes he contemplated, could not fail to excite their indignation. If they were convinced that the Corn Laws were essential, not merely to the prosperity, but to the existence, of the landed interest, he had been mainly instrumental in confirming this conviction. It was indeed a matter of extraordinary difficulty and nicety to determine at what precise period he should begin to disclose to his supporters the extent of the plans which he meditated. His reserve may have been prudent, possibly indispensable; but although they were not unsuspicious of his intentions, and distrusted and disliked him accordingly, they were wholly unprepared for the great revolution which he suddenly proclaimed; and at such a moment of terror and dismay it was not unnatural that despair and rage should supersede every other sentiment, and that they should loudly complain of having been deceived, betrayed, and abandoned.'—*'Greville Memoirs'* (Second Part), vol. i. p. 356.

If the reader goes to Mr. Walpole for the history of this crisis, 1845-6, he will find that the writer's deficiencies in accuracy of statement and sense of proportion are not compensated for by clearness of arrangement. In the nineteenth chapter he takes up Irish policy, and because the Irish famine precipitated Peel's Free-trade schemes, and he was finally turned out of office by a party combination on the Irish Coercion Bill, political history, from August, 1845, to May, 1846, is added as a conclusion to the Irish chapter. The events of these few months were but the culminating efforts of opposing forces which had been in operation from the commencement of Peel's triumph in 1841. It is only in their study we can find a key to the problems of English politics for the next twenty years. The connection between these events and Peel's Irish policy is very slight, whilst their relation to the Anti-Corn Law League, and to the economic condition of England, and the light they throw on the personal characteristics of Sir Robert Peel, are exceedingly important; but the reader is left to supply these lessons for himself, and has no clear information of the singular position of affairs at the close of 1846, when the Whigs resumed office, and, with the exception of Free-trade, proceeded to undo much that Peel had achieved.

The Ministry which succeeded was a repetition of the Whig helplessness of 1835-1841. The new Government was like that of Lord Melbourne, a Government of Whigs, but it differed from that of Lord Melbourne in this, that its support was largely made up of a separate English party, the Free-traders representing the middle classes. Lord Melbourne depended on the aid

aid of O'Connell; and the first Russell Administration lived from day to day because it was more useful to the Free-trade party than the Peelites with their reduced numbers could possibly be. The process of applying Free-trade principles to the whole of our fiscal system was one that could be only carried out after a succession of years, and to secure this full application of their principles it became necessary to support a Ministry which included Lord Palmerston as Minister of Foreign Affairs. Lord John Russell was the chief survivor in the Whig ranks of the Reform struggle. His immediate following consisted of the old official Whigs and of the O'Connellites, who had been practically broken up as a separate party during Peel's Administration.

If the constitution of the Ministerial party was singular, that of the Opposition was still more extraordinary. It was considerable in numbers and formidable in abilities and experience. But, speaking broadly, we may say that the abilities and experience constituted one section and the numbers another, whilst the two parts were irrevocably opposed to each other. With the exception of Russell and Palmerston, the Cabinet could not boast any array of men to vie with Peel, Graham, Sidney Herbert, Gladstone, Lord Lincoln, and a number of capable pupils of Peel, like Cardwell. Beside these men on the front Opposition bench sat the leaders of the real Opposition in the Commons, Bentinck and Disraeli, with the whole voting power of the Opposition behind them. After the election of 1847 the Ministry had a secure majority on the main question, Free-trade, whilst the Peelites were always ready to contribute their assistance in debate. The adjustment of fiscal arrangements to the new state of things was the chief English business of the next three years.

Sir Charles Wood was Lord John Russell's Chancellor of the Exchequer, and on him fell the main burden of this work, the development of Peel's fiscal policy. In Greville we have a curious account how some of Peel's measures were regarded by the men who came into office to carry out his Free-trade principles, and who were kept in office some six years by the votes of the Free-trade party. Writing in 1848, he says:—

‘Charles Wood lamented to me very bitterly the fatal effects of the mistake Peel had made in abolishing all Corn duty whatever (prospectively) and the Timber duties. He said George Bentinck was quite right in his preference for low duties instead of abolition, and that if we could now have the above duties they would relieve the revenue from almost all its difficulties, and be felt by nobody; and the unhappy thing is that this mistake is irretrievable, for *revocare gradum*

gradum is totally impossible. Peel acknowledged his error about timber, and probably he might also about corn. He was, in fact, misled and carried away by his flourishing revenue, and acted without consideration.'—Greville (Second Part), vol. iii. pp. 237, 238.

The new controversies which occupied the Parliament of 1847 related to Ireland and the Roman Catholics. The great opportunity of the Russell Cabinet was Irish policy, and this their incapacity fatally sacrificed. The failure of the potato crop in 1845 had two direct effects upon the policy of Sir Robert Peel—one positive, one negative. The sudden disappearance of the chief source of the people's food precipitated the abolition of restrictions on the importation of corn. The consequent collapse of the Ministry interrupted that new policy of taking Ireland in hand, which Peel had pledged himself to by the Maynooth Grant and the prosecution of O'Connell. The Whig policy had been to do nothing but express a pious opinion in favour of what was obviously impracticable, and what after the accession of Gregory XVI. would have been dangerous, the endowment of the Roman clergy; and failing this ideal, to retain O'Connell as a great middleman between England and the disaffected Irish population. This policy Peel set aside. He gave the Roman clergy substantial assistance by the increase of the Maynooth Grant. In conjunction with the leaders of the Irish Roman Catholics, he improved the system of popular education established by Lord Stanley. In conformity with the principles of this scheme, he founded a system of higher education in which he invited Romanist and Orangeman to meet on equal terms, he organized the Irish police, and he prosecuted O'Connell. It is true that the prosecution was technically a failure; but it demonstrated that O'Connell no longer represented the Government, as he did in the eyes of the Irish crowd during Lord Melbourne's Administration. Peel was preparing to deal with the economic condition of Ireland, as far as legislation could do so, when his Ministry came to an end.

Thus the Whig party in 1846 had a free hand. Their opposition to Peel's Coercion Bill precluded them from adopting his policy in support of authority; but his policy on the economic condition of Ireland had been rather suggested than formulated, and this branch of the subject they might have made their own.

The O'Connellite power was broken. Death soon removed O'Connell himself. Peel's policy on Maynooth had established new relations with the Roman Catholic interest. The crisis of the potato famine had rivetted public attention on the deplorable economic condition of Ireland. Numbers of people dying by hunger on the roadside had deeply moved the public. The

vision

vision of some millions threatened with a similar fate gave a capable Government strength enough to carry any scheme against which only novelty could be pleaded.

Next in importance to the character of Peel is the history of Irish policy during the great transition period from aristocratic to popular government; but here Mr. Walpole gives us as little assistance as he did on the larger theme, the character of England's greatest Minister in this century. We have dissertations on Irish politics wanting in accurate knowledge and clear utterance. The reader will soon discern that the Irish chapters are the result of an extensive study of popular writers rather than any product of an independent judgment. The writings of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy would give us more help in this part of the history than Mr. Walpole's ambitious volumes. In Duffy's vigorous chapters we know exactly where we are, and this is more than the reader will be able to say when perusing Mr. Walpole. The artificial character of this part of the work is curiously illustrated by the account of the O'Connellite demonstration which gave occasion to the prosecution of 1843.

'The hill of Clontarf rises on the north side of the bay of Dublin. It overlooks the city which has for centuries been the capital of the Irish nation, and the beautiful bay which has been the constant subject of Irish song. But, even before the smoke cloud which shrouds the joys and sorrows, the hopes and disappointments of a populous city, the Irishman at Clontarf can think only of the past. It was at Clontarf that Brian Boru won his crowning victory and secured his country's independence.'—Walpole, iv. p. 336.

Mr. Walpole has heard of the hill of Tara where the Irish kings were crowned of old, of the hill of Cashel, 'the city of the kings,' he knows that hills generally stand out in Irish politics and rhetoric. Looking at Ireland from the intellectual point of view of the modern Radical, he could not be expected to have gone into any details about a country whose fate has been settled long ago by de Beaumont and other political philosophers. He could not be required to know from his own knowledge that Clontarf is one of the flattest districts in the neighbourhood of Dublin, but if he had read Mr. Freeman he might have been aware that in the 10th and 11th centuries invading hosts did not generally land upon hillsides. Clontarf was chosen by the Danish invader because it was a wide shelving beach, without any eminence near, just as some half-century later Pevensey was chosen by the invading host of William. Mr. Walpole may be justified in thinking that Ireland is a hopeless mess, and that the sooner we leave it to be dealt with by Mr. Parnell or Mr. Davitt according to Irish ideas the better,

better, but he ought not as an Englishman to increase the sum of Saxon wrongs by attenuating the glory of the one distinguished warrior Celtic Ireland can boast. If he accepts the Irish narrative which tells how Brian Boroihme conquered dying in the hour of victory, he ought to admit that the hero met his enemies in fair fight upon level ground. To suggest that he may owe part of his glory to the extraordinary folly of an invading host in landing at the foot of a hill is a mistake, which can only be explained by the writer's dreamy inaccuracy.

We will not dwell upon the various expedients adopted by the Government to relieve Irish distress in 1847 and 1848. Their purpose was good, if their wisdom was doubtful. We hasten on to 1849, when the conspicuous fact was, that the poor-law system had failed, and if public men were entitled to plead exceptional and unforeseen circumstances in previous Sessions, no such excuse could be made at a time when the problem of Irish poverty had been before the country for more than three years. Yet the Government were without any scheme. The loss of 14,000,000*l.* worth of food had been an unforeseen accident in 1847. The expenditure of 700,000*l.* a month on works of doubtful advantage in 1848 was another, and in 1849 there was yet a third unforeseen accident, the bankruptcy of twenty-one Poor Law Unions.

The public demanded with impatience some definite proposal. The situation was a critical one for the Government. Heavy as was the distress, the actual amount of starvation was trivial compared to the ghastly misery of the previous years. Trade was bad in England, and men were more disposed to reckon up the cost than they were in the earlier stages of the disaster. The public mind was relieved now that the community had safely passed through the crisis of the previous year, with its Irish rebellion, its Chartist demonstration, and the hurricane of revolution on the Continent of Europe. Political criticism was more active. The Ministry fenced with the question the whole of February.

If we return to Mr. Walpole's pages to see how this episode of a Government drifting through a great emergency is recorded for posterity, we are astonished to find how completely his account of Irish policy this Session misrepresents the actual facts:—

'At the outset of the Session the Ministry asked for and obtained a vote of 50,000*l.* to aid bankrupt unions in the task of feeding the people. The vote was granted, but the sum was only intended as a temporary makeshift. The Ministry almost simultaneously invited both branches of the Legislature to appoint select committees to enquire into the operation of the Irish Poor Law. References of this kind

kind are usually made excuses for delay, but *no charge of procrastination could fairly be brought against the Ministry of 1849.* Russell at once laid before the Commons Committee the details of the scheme on which he relied in the emergency, and obtaining the adhesion of the Committee to one portion of it, introduced a Bill to give effect to it.—Walpole, iv. p. 352.

Let us compare this testimony to the energy and spirit of the Government with the language of Greville, the friend of the Ministers. His pages confess with shame the uncertainty and confusion which prevailed in the Ministerial ranks. Writing in February, he says:—‘When Charles Wood proposed his grant of 50,000*l.*, he had no idea of meeting with any opposition, for he told me that he was not sure whether he should give the Irish 50,000*l.* or 100,000*l.* ;’ and he goes on, ‘Nobody knows whether it will be carried or not, but it is quite certain that nothing more will be given.’ Lord Lansdowne had one scheme, Lord Clarendon another, Sir Charles Wood a third, and the course taken by the Government varied from day to day:—

‘Nobody knows what to do; everybody hints at some scheme or plan to which his next neighbour objects . . . all call on the Government for a plan and a remedy, but the Government have no plan and no remedy; there is nothing but disagreement among them; and while they are discussing and disputing, the masses are dying.’—Greville (Second Part), p. 267.

The gravity of the crisis was illustrated by the readiness with which one public man after another came forward to propose plans on his own responsibility. Sir James Graham, when the 50,000*l.* vote was asked for, supported it on two conditions: first, that this was to be the last vote of the kind; secondly, that it should be followed by a Bill extending the area of poor-law taxation in certain cases all over Ireland. Sir James was known to have entertained overtures from Lord John Russell to enter the Cabinet; and the Ministry were at once challenged by Mr. Disraeli to pledge themselves to the policy of their new ally, or to repudiate it. In the other House, Lord Stanley volunteered a declaration on the subject, advocating the reduction of the area of taxation, so that each large estate should be responsible for its own poor. On this condition he was ready to accept a rate in aid of limited amount to save the embarrassed unions.

In Committee it soon appeared that the Government were ready to adopt the suggestion of Sir James Graham, a rate in aid to be levied throughout Ireland. It is not easy to find in history anything more faulty in policy, and unfair in its operation, than

than this proposal. A disaffected population, whose wild attempt at rebellion had been vigorously suppressed the previous year, were suddenly reminded that, although they belonged to the United Kingdom, they were yet separated by the sea, and must look in an emergency to their neighbours of the North, and not to the British public at large, for assistance. The people of Ulster had struggled through the hard times with great difficulty. There, as in the South and West, the failure of the potato had been a heavy blow, but the thrift and energy of the people had enabled them to get through the crisis without disaster. They had neither control nor influence over the other parts of Ireland. Their business connections and interests allied them much more to Scotland and England than to the South and West of Ireland; yet, because they were separated from Great Britain by the sea, they were made liable for the improvidence or misfortune of their southern neighbours. In the poor-law of Elizabeth, the locality with which that Act started was the parish, and, failing the resources of the parish, there was power to go to the hundred, and then to the county; but the principle of vicinage and local control, if not direct control, the control arising from immediate neighbourhood, ran through the whole system.

Mr. Walpole, who applauds the Government, as we have already seen, for their energy this Session, goes on to tell us in reference to the rate-in-aid 'in a great speech, in which he unfolded his whole ideas of Irish policy, Peel gave the support of his authority to the measure of the Government.' We have an analysis of Peel's argument in support of the Government on the 5th of March, but the fact is not stated that this support was expressly given to the Bill as a first step towards a large comprehensive scheme, of which Peel gave an outline. Three weeks afterwards, on the second reading of this Bill, he returned to the subject in a speech of which Greville writes, 'on Thursday last Peel made a great speech, bringing forward very elaborately his views of Irish relief.'

These speeches throw a remarkable light on Peel's character, on the condition of politics at the time he spoke, and are not without importance even at this day in relation to Irish affairs. He declared: 'To lay the foundation of a better state of things, measures of no common plan, of no ordinary character, are requisite.' He went on to sketch out one of the largest schemes of State intervention ever suggested, the appointment of a Commission empowered to take possession of the bankrupt unions, with responsibility for the life of the people in the district, and for the property of the landowner, but with full authority to start public works, organize fisheries, promote emigration, and settle

on suitable terms a new class of agriculturists on the land. He referred at length to the settlement of Ulster made by James I., and he concluded with these impressive words :

‘Reject this proposal if you will, but propose some other. If you can propose a better, there is no man in this House who would give it a more cordial support than I shall. I make this proposal without adventitious party aid. I know not who agrees with or who differs from me. I make it solely under the influence of sympathy for an unfortunate country, and with the conviction that some decisive measure is necessary for the relief, not only of Ireland, but of this country. *Let us remember that it is impossible to free ourselves from the connection with Ireland !*

‘In evils which afflict the natural body, there may be the means of relief by violent remedies. If an unprofitable member offend you, you may cut it off and cast it from you. If a tree be unfruitful and cumbereth the ground, you may cut it down. You have no such remedy for the evils which afflict the social system. You must cure the diseased part or bear with it, though its evil influence should affect your vital energies. You have no such remedy as excision, no power to cut off and cast from you the offending member of the social body. It is in the growing conviction that its weakness will be our weakness, its disease our disease, that I see the faint hope of a decisive remedy. It has pleased God to afflict us with a great calamity, which may perhaps be improved into a blessing if it awakens us to a due sense of the danger which threatens us : without this danger we might have gone on from year to year with little thought of the future, still trusting in one precarious root for the subsistence of millions, these millions badly and insufficiently fed in the years of abundance, and doomed to starvation in the years of dearth. Let us now profit by this solemn warning, let us deeply consider whether out of this nettle, danger, we may not pluck the flower, safety, and convert a grievous affliction into a means of future improvement and a source of future security.’—Hansard, 3rd series, vol. civ. pp. 114, 116, 117.

The economists were startled by this new departure of their great convert, and Mr. Bright opened the debate the following night in a speech intended to discourage Peel’s scheme of State intervention, but full of sympathy with his disposition towards Ireland, and of censure upon the incapacity of the Government.

Appealing to Lord John Russell, he said :—

‘Sir, if ever there was an opportunity for a statesman it is this. This is the hour undoubtedly, and we want the man. . . .

‘I have been much disappointed that upon this Irish question he’ (Lord John) ‘has seemed to shrink from a full consideration of the difficulty and from a resolution to meet it fairly. The character of the present, the character of any Government, under such circumstances would be at stake. The noble Lord cannot in his position remain inactive.

inactive. Let him be as innocent as he may, he can never justify himself to the country, or to the world, or to posterity, if he remains at the head of this Imperial Legislature, and still is unable or unwilling to carry forward measures for the restoration of Ireland.'—Hansard, 3rd series, vol. civ. p. 178.

Coming from a man of Peel's experience and characteristic caution, from one who had on many previous occasions urged that in Opposition he was not bound to offer any scheme himself, and contrasting, as his proposal did, with the vacillation of the Government, this speech made a profound and lasting impression on the public mind. In Mr. Greville's Journal there are many indications of the uneasiness it produced in the Ministerial combination. Lord Clarendon came to the assistance of the Cabinet, had several interviews with Peel, and apparently succeeded in getting him to desist from embarrassing the Government by pursuing a scheme of this magnitude. It would seem that Clarendon persuaded him to continue his support to a Government who could be depended on to persevere in a Free-trade policy, rather than to risk the overthrow of his fiscal scheme by any conflict with them on the subject of Ireland.

There are no speeches which give better, than these of Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Bright, the key to the politics of the long transition period Mr. Walpole has undertaken to describe; yet Peel's most important speech is only mentioned in a footnote reference, and of Mr. Bright's there is no record.

Mr. Walpole's chapter on the Oxford movement we need not discuss. That development of opinion is an important part of the history of the period; but it can hardly be said to have affected political events during the period included in these volumes, except in securing the enlargement of the powers of Convocation in 1852, and except so far as its prevalence in England influenced, as there is reason to believe it did influence, the mind of the Curia, and precipitated what was known as the Papal Aggression of 1851. That incident did more than anything which happened since the fall of Peel to add to the confusion of parties. The chaos to which it reduced the Liberal party illustrated, in a very remarkable way, the want of foresight and distinct principle among the Liberal leaders; and in dealing with this eventful year, Mr. Walpole is almost as poor a guide as he is for 1849.

In examining the Session of 1851, it should not be forgotten that not only was Mr. Disraeli the Leader of the Opposition, but he was undisputed Leader on that side of the House, for Peel had died the previous summer, and there was no one to take his place as leader of the Peelite section. That section

still remained, but it was a group of eminent men rather than a party.

The exact motives which animated the chief actor in this crisis, Lord John Russell, can hardly be said to be clearly established. A thorough believer in Whig traditions, he had a natural sympathy with the old Protestant feeling of Corporal Trim, who grouped in one denunciation the Devil, the Pope, and the Pretender; an insult to national dignity, and one offered by the Papacy, stirred his resentment; and he probably felt real anger when he wrote the letter to the Bishop of Durham in November 1850. But whilst in writing that letter he gave natural expression to his feelings as an hereditary Whig, he could not be expected to forget, that he was chief of a great party, toiling laboriously now for the fourth year to keep his following in power, amidst circumstances of great discouragement. Suddenly a strong flood of popular feeling had welled up and swept over the country. The Papal Aggression had united all sections of Churchmen, and had even brought together Churchmen and Dissenters. A Minister, who could give expression to this great national emotion, seemed to have a fine opportunity of consolidating his power. It is difficult to believe that Russell was not influenced by some such idea when he boldly took the lead in the agitation of the autumn of 1850.

If we would realize the intensity of the national excitement, we must recollect that the Catholic revival had for some time strongly agitated the public mind. The secession of Dr. Newman to Rome in 1843 had produced a great effect in University circles, but the public cared little about it until in subsequent years they saw evidence of his influence and example in the secession of numbers of less known people, clergy and laymen. The power of Rome appeared to be advancing everywhere, not only hurling defiance at the English public from the Flaminian Gate, but working within the English Church itself.

The difficulties of the question were increased by the associations of the party whose leader was now pledged to legislation. The Whigs represented that group of English public men, who for some forty years previous to the Catholic Relief Acts had been known as 'Catholics,' a term given to, and accepted by, various politicians irrespective of party, as indicating their convictions on the particular question of admitting Roman Catholics to full civil rights. Many members of the Government, like Lord John Russell and Sir George Grey, were the very men who had in previous years suffered exclusion from office, because they flouted the current theories of danger to the State from the Roman Church.

Church. In pursuance of their teachings, there had been admitted to practical equality in the Kingdom a great community, whose religious organization bound them to recognize and follow the orders of a foreign personage. The Statute Law and the Common Law of England protested against his authority, and innumerable enactments were in force to provide that no act done by him should have legal validity in England. When his followers in this country were received into full citizenship, various new safeguards against him were invented. But these were either qualified by subsequent legislation, or ignored in practice. The Ministry in office were almost the same men who were parties to the Lichfield House compact for the Government of Ireland by the aid of O'Connell and the priestly power. Only two sessions before, in pursuance of the same theory, that Protestant England might treat Rome's pretensions with indifference, they had passed an Act of Parliament to remove the prohibition on official intercourse with the head of the Roman State.

In face of the Pope's ostentatious parade of power in England, the Liberal party had to choose between two courses. They had either to proceed on their old lines, admitting that many venerable enactments should share the fate of the restrictions they had been recently abolishing in the Catholic Relief Acts, that any exercise of Papal power in reference to the Roman Communion, however arrogant the exercise, or offensive to English feeling, must be ignored, until it resulted in some act violating the ordinary laws of the country; or they were bound to say, that the qualifications enacted in 1829 were not enough, and that new limitations were required.

Amidst the general excitement, the Ministry chose the alternative of going back to restriction; and their inability to reconcile their past traditions and policy with their new position gave the Peelite party an opportunity of which they took advantage with consummate ability.

Lord John Russell introduced a scheme, making any one who assumed ecclesiastical titles under Papal authority, and in a form implying a claim to territorial jurisdiction, liable to heavy pecuniary fines. The difference between such an enactment and the formidable laws actually in existence, prohibiting dealing with Rome, made the contrast between former times and policy and the present too conspicuous. If the new law was to be taken as a following up of the rigorous statutes of *præmunire*, it was absurd. If it was to be judged by itself as a piece of modern legislation, it was so much out of harmony with any Acts of Parliament known to our Judicature, that its enforcement would be a matter of great doubt and difficulty.

The

The Irish supporters of Government became furious opponents. The Tories laughed at the Bill, as not being what it pretended to be, and remained unpledged on the general question. The Peelites vigorously denounced it as a retrogression from the principles of general toleration towards the organization of religious communions, principles to which, they contended, the Liberal party and the country were pledged. Before the second reading, Mr. Disraeli's annual motion on agricultural distress came on, and the majority of the Government was smaller than in any previous years.

A few days afterwards Mr. Locke King moved a resolution on the franchise, which created so little interest that the House only mustered 156. The Ministry resisted the motion, and were beaten by a majority of 48. This defeat of Thursday was hardly so much a surprise as the announcement the next evening, that the Ministry intended to take it seriously. On Saturday the Queen received their resignation.

The ordinary Ministerial following was quite strong enough to have averted the defeat on Thursday night. There was no question of the motion being defeated, if the Government, who opposed, had taken proper steps to support their opinion; and to treat the vote as one determining the existence of the Ministry was an expedient which nothing but the water-logged condition of the Government bark could explain. It was an opportunity either to force the newly fledged Opposition into office before their policy on Protection was settled, or to secure support for the rest of the Session from moderate men by demonstrating the incapacity of any one else to carry on the Queen's Government. It was, in fact, an example of the same kind of device which Mr. Gladstone adopted in June 1885.

Lord Stanley at his first interview with the Queen declined to attempt to form a Ministry, until the Queen had ascertained whether the Peelites would undertake the task either with Lord John Russell or without him. Lord Aberdeen, when sent for, declined at once, on the ground of the popular feeling on the Ecclesiastical Titles Question. The Queen then sent again for Stanley, who now undertook the task. His party remained unpledged on the Papal question, and if the Peelites could have been induced to join, he was apparently ready to adopt their views as regards the Titles Bill, but on economic questions the gulf was impassable. Lord Stanley could not pledge himself to renounce Protection. Failing to obtain any aid from the Peelites, with characteristic energy he set about constructing a Cabinet of his own following, and if we may trust Lord Malmesbury's recollection, it was Mr. Henley's dismay at the responsibility

responsibility of office which finally dashed the scheme. Mr. Greville suggests that on this side there was a difficulty, the converse of that Lord Stanley had with the Peelites. He would not pledge himself to restore Protection.

This episode kept the Ministry together for another Session, but it did not give them any visible strength. The Papal Bill was accepted as a disagreeable burden that had to be carried on. The public estimation, which the action of the Peelite party in connection with the recent crisis gained for Graham, Aberdeen, and their allies, made them most destructive critics; and their growth in influence and position was one of the chief political results of the year.

It has always been a fine characteristic of English politics that out-spoken belief in a particular policy attracts interest and respect, and nothing could exceed the directness with which both Lord Aberdeen and Sir James Graham challenged the Government scheme. The Peelite party distinctly gained ground; and Mr. Gladstone, who in the previous Session had supported what the Free-trade party regarded as an assault on their whole work, and in February had abstained from voting on Mr. Disraeli's motion, now in April declared himself distinctly opposed to the modified policy of the Protectionist party. His position as regards the Liberal and Tory parties had hitherto been almost as undecided as it was subsequently in 1856-1858.

If we turn to Mr. Walpole's volumes, we find that the significance of the stratagem of February 1851 has altogether escaped him. He does not even give us the facts. He treats the resignation as a matter of course, and goes on, 'The Cabinet unanimously decided to retire;' but we know from Hansard * that one member of the Cabinet was not even consulted on the scheme which the nimble intellect of Russell had devised. Lord Lansdowne, who happened to be away from town on Friday, did not know he was out of office until he returned to London on Saturday. The remarkable part, too, taken in the discussions on the Titles Bill by the Peelites, which had such a distinct influence on their subsequent fortunes, is not even referred to.

The quarrel between Russell and Palmerston in the following December (1851) deprived the Ministry of the one strong man they had. It is a curious testimony to the individuality of Lord Palmerston, that Mr. Walpole, who gives us the expression of modern Radicalism, and Mr. Greville, the confidant of the early nineteenth-century Whigs, are both agreed in decrying the man who was one of the most popular and powerful Ministers

* Hansard, 3rd series, vol. 114, p. 1004.

that

that England ever had. Mr. Walpole objects to his policy as not in accordance with that spirit of non-intervention which Mr. Cobden and Mr. Gladstone made popular, and both he and Mr. Greville alike condemn his manners and his methods. In the limits of this article we shall not attempt to discuss the different views which have been taken on these questions. Whether Lord Palmerston conducted his business at the Foreign Office with proper decorum or with the finest taste, are not matters in which a public, who still suffer from a Gladstone-Granville conduct of foreign affairs, will take a deep interest. What they will feel is that, from 1832 down to his later days, Palmerston recognized England's great influence and responsibility in Europe, and believed that our international relations would proceed most smoothly with those nations which enjoyed a vigorous and healthy government. To bring the governments of Europe into more friendly relations with their subjects, was, he thought, the best way of promoting the interests of England; and this object he pursued, as far as international propriety allowed, without regarding the prejudices of monarchs or the cabals of courts. He had been accused for nearly twenty years of being the favourite of Republicans; but he soon came to the conclusion, that the second French Republic was not a stable institution. When it received its *coup de grâce* from Louis Napoleon, he hastened to recognize the advent of a ruler who might secure to France a vigorous and durable government. The mode in which this was done gave Lord John Russell the excuse for getting rid of a colleague, whose imperiousness had no doubt long been irksome to the Prime Minister and his party. Lord Palmerston had always been odious to the economists who followed Mr. Cobden; but hitherto his expressions of sympathy had been with populations chafing against the ill-judged exercise of power, and his popularity in England was as great with the masses as with the general public. In December 1851 he was found expressing goodwill towards a ruler who had just upset a constitution. In this proceeding he could not attract the sympathies of English Liberals; and here there was an opportunity of getting rid of a rival who had almost become a master. In the pages of Mr. Greville and of Sir Theodore Martin, the full details of the dismissal of Lord Palmerston are recorded; but the fact, that Lord John Russell made Lord Palmerston's disregard of propriety in not submitting his despatches to the Queen the ground of dismissal, thus to some extent sheltering himself under the discontent of the Court, prepared the public for that reaction in Lord Palmerston's favour from which Lord John Russell never recovered.

Within

Within a fortnight after Parliament met (1852), Lord Palmerston's amendment on the Militia Bill obliged the Queen to send for Lord Stanley, who had in the interval since the crisis of the previous year succeeded his father, Lord Derby. This time he determined not to disappoint his followers. After renewed but fruitless negotiations with the Peelites, and some friendly conferences with Palmerston, he formed a Cabinet, in which he himself and Mr. Herries were the only men who had sat in a Cabinet before.

The new Prime Minister was a better type than any one else, perhaps, in English history of the noble amateur politician. The Greys were born politicians, and only by accident country gentlemen and nobles; Lord John Russell was welcomed to public life as representing a great Ducal family, and his career under Lord Grey gave him a distinguished position among English public men, but he became a professional party leader. Lord Derby was by nature the great noble, loving his ease, his country residence, his sports, his rural genial surroundings. His position invited him to public life; and to that he brought a clearness of thought, an aptness of expression, unequalled in his time. Though not a scholar in the sense in which Sir George Cornewall Lewis was a scholar, he had no mean literary gifts. It is not so much grace we find in his speeches as fiery vigour and telling precision. An accomplished writer describes him as 'playing the game of politics with more of party than of public spirit,' yet love of party is one of the last accusations which can be maintained against him. In defence of a principle he left the Whig party in 1833, and the Peelite party in 1845. Nor can he be accused of love for office. He refused it in 1851, as he refused it again in 1855. Greville had no liking for Lord Derby, who had quitted the Whig ranks, and he disputes his claims to be considered generous and chivalrous. Lord Derby was the last man to make parade of any kind, and effusiveness was not one of his characteristics; but we see from Greville himself the great qualities with which his contemporaries credited him, and when the cotton famine fell upon Lancashire every one recognized the unbounded liberality with which he came to the relief of his suffering neighbours. He was always prepared to do with all his energy whatever his position required; and called to office in 1852, just as he had been called by his difference with Sir Robert Peel to the leadership of the country party, he applied himself to his work with all the resolution of a proud nature, all the resources of his brilliant abilities.

The inexperience of the Ministry of 1852 was not their difficulty.

culty. They had been marshalled as a party to advocate a particular policy, and this policy circumstances had made impracticable. Lord Derby declined to pledge himself as to his future policy, until the country had been consulted. The election of July brought him great increase of strength; but it was evident that the country was not Protectionist. The question was, could the party, whose battle cry had been so long the restoration of Protection, hold office on the simple ground, that they were likely to be more efficient than the men who had preceded them? Mr. Disraeli was quite prepared for this test. Any general financial scheme had been postponed until after the elections. Early in December came Mr. Disraeli's great effort—a new financial policy—nor was the difficulty small. He had to admit, finally, that there was no going back to Protection, and at the same time to reconcile his disappointed followers to the small amount of help he was able to give to agricultural distress. The disastrous fortune which attended the scheme, the greater distinction in finance afterwards attained by his rival, have discredited the Budget of December 1852; but any one who takes the trouble to read Disraeli's speech of December 4, will be prepared for Greville's statement. 'The Budget has been, on the whole, tolerably well received, and may, I think, be considered successful.' This testimony is the more significant from the grudging manner in which it is given.

Before the scheme came on for final discussion, the Opposition had made up their quarrels. Grave mismanagement of one of the most important measures introduced by the Ministry, the Irish Land Bill, had generated distrust among the Irish members. The Budget was attacked by Mr. Gladstone in a speech of exceptional violence, delivered in violation of Parliamentary practice after Disraeli had closed the debate on behalf of the Government, and was rejected by a majority of 19, and the first Derby Ministry came to an end. The rivalry, thus formally established between Gladstone and Disraeli, was to some extent in abeyance during Lord Palmerston's first Administration, when from 1855 to 1859 the Peelites remained out of office, but it was practically one of the chief features in English public life from 1852 to Disraeli's death in 1882.

Various plans for bringing Palmerston and Russell together into a new Cabinet had been elaborated in the retirement of opposition. The co-operation of the Peelites was an essential part of these schemes of the autumn, and when the time for carrying them into execution came, it was found that the combination could be best carried out by making Lord Aberdeen

Prime

Prime Minister. Mr. Greville gives an amusing account of the dismay of the Whigs at finding the large proportion of seats in the new Cabinet allotted to the Peelites.

'The Government is now complete, except some of the minor appointments and the Household. It has not been a smooth and easy business by any means, and there is anything but contentment, cordiality, and zeal in the confederated party. The Whigs are excessively dissatisfied with the share of places allotted to them, and complain that every Peelite, without exception, has been provided for, while half the Whigs are excluded. Though they exaggerate the case, there is a good deal of justice in their complaints, and they have a right to murmur against Aberdeen for not doing more for them, and John Russell for not insisting on a larger share of patronage for his friends. Clarendon told me last night that the Peelites have behaved very ill, and have grasped at everything, and he mentioned some very flagrant cases, in which, after the distribution had been settled between Aberdeen and John Russell, Newcastle and Sidney Herbert, for they appear to have been the most active in the matter, persuaded Aberdeen to alter it, and bestow or offer offices intended for Whigs to Peelites, and, in some instances, to Derbyites who had been Peelites. Clarendon has been all along very anxious to get Brougham into the Cabinet as President of the Council, and he proposed it both to Lord John and Aberdeen, and the latter acquiesced, and Clarendon thought it was going to be arranged that Granville should be President of the Board of Trade, and Brougham President of Council; but Newcastle and Sidney Herbert not only upset this plan, but proposed that Ellenborough should be President of Council, and then, when he was objected to, Harrowby.'—Greville (Third Part), vol. i. pp. 25, 26.

Mr. Greville naturally sympathized with the sorrows of his Whig friends; but if the Peelites, taken by themselves, counted few votes, they brought to the Ministry the personal reputation they had won for ability and independence, and they added to the Whig votes the support of the Free-traders and the Roman Catholics. The Ministry thus formed was celebrated for the brilliant achievements of Mr. Gladstone in finance, and for its ignominious collapse, after little more than two years' duration, in the crisis of the Crimean war. The origin of that war we shall not attempt here to discuss. Favourable as Mr. Walpole is to the character of Lord Aberdeen, he is obliged to admit that the Emperor Nicholas's belief in the peace policy of Lord Aberdeen had much to do with the persistence of the Russian aggression.

'Yet at that supreme moment, there was one man who desired peace with all his soul. Peace was the sum and substance of Aberdeen's policy. No Englishman then alive had done so much for peace. But the exertions which he had made in that sacred cause in the past had now actually become inducements for war. Nicholas could

could not believe that war was possible while Aberdeen, the Minister with whom he had conversed in 1844, presided over the British Ministry.'—Walpole, vol. v. p. 88.

Here we have a curious example of Mr. Walpole's style and order of political thought. We should have supposed that a responsible English Minister would know but one 'cause'—the interests of his country—and we do not believe that there has ever been an English Minister for the last hundred years, who would have advocated war, if the interests of England were safe without it. To say that a particular Minister ought to avoid war is only to testify to his sense of public duty; but to suggest that a man occupying Aberdeen's position was thinking, not of the most sacred cause of all for one in his place, how best to maintain the rights and dignity of England, but of some special predilection in favour of peace principles, is a statement which we think even the mild Aberdeen would have resented. Yet Mr. Walpole evidently thinks he is paying the Minister a compliment in comparing him to some popular lecturer devoting himself to the propagation of new opinions.

When the fall of the Ministry came with Mr. Roebuck's motion in January 1855, Lord Derby was again invited to form an Administration. He mustered a party of much the same strength which he reckoned in December 1852, when he was defeated by a majority of 19, and if this were a time for counting heads, there was much to be said for declining the responsibilities of office; but in a great hour of national trial, such as the winter of 1854-55, ordinary party considerations were set aside, as was shown by the fact, that the Ministerial following in the division on Roebuck's motion was reduced to 147. Lord Derby was not the man to shrink from responsibility, still less to be unconscious of the grandeur of the position now opened to him, invited to deliver his country not from defeat, for victory in the field had always crowned our arms, but from dire affliction and the greatest apprehension at the incapacity of our Administration. Lord Palmerston was popular in the press and in the country generally, but he had no personal following in the House of Commons. He was one of the defeated Ministry, the man who had been three years before removed from office, practically at the instance of the Queen, and he was still supposed to be regarded with suspicion by her and the Prince Consort.

Lord Derby pointed out to the Queen the comparative neutrality which, from a sense of patriotism, he and his party had observed in regard to criticism on the conduct of the war, the deficiency of his own numbers, and the importance of securing

securing Lord Palmerston's aid. To this the Queen assented, and, failing Lord Palmerston's co-operation, Lord Derby advised that the Queen should consider what other chances there were of forming a Ministry, and should depend on him only as the final resort, when he would undertake to form a Cabinet as best he could. Lord Derby tells us, that the expedients which the Queen might adopt between the first and the last of these plans were not suggested by him, and it does not appear that any intervening projects of administration were discussed at this interview. When he returned from Windsor, he acted on the Queen's permission to seek Lord Palmerston's help, offering him, on his own and on Disraeli's behalf, the Leadership of the House of Commons, and two other seats in the Cabinet for two of his former colleagues. So favourably were Lord Derby's overtures received by Lord Palmerston, that Lord Malmesbury, who saw Lord Derby later in the day whilst the Queen's messenger was still waiting to take to the Queen Lord Derby's final acceptance of office with Palmerston as his colleague, considered the question settled, and went home to arrange for taking up whatever work might be assigned to him in the new Cabinet. In the evening Palmerston wrote briefly, declining to join. Next day the Queen tried the plan which the Whigs had for some time cherished, and sent for Lord Lansdowne. On his refusal on personal grounds, she summoned Lord John Russell, and, when he, after some days' delay declined, she sent for Palmerston. Palmerston's general popularity was present to the minds of all ; but his appointment to the highest office was probably a contingency which the smallness of his Parliamentary following and his personal relations with the Court made so remote, that neither Lord Derby nor others regarded it seriously as a practicable solution of the national difficulties. Greville, following the crisis from day to day, does not suggest the possibility of a Palmerston Administration until the very day on which that Minister received his commission from the Queen. Once invited, he accepted without hesitation, and the crisis came to an end. The history of the Ministerial crisis is given at length by Sir Theodore Martin,* who tells us that it was 'prepared from very elaborate memoranda, drawn up by the Prince from day to day, while it lasted' ; but he does not mention the curious fact, which we learn for the first time from Greville, that it was Lord Clarendon who persuaded the Queen to send for Lord Palmerston.

'When Clarendon went to the Queen and explained his own conduct to her, and she expressed to him the embarrassment she felt and asked

* 'Life of the Prince Consort,' vol. iii. p. 202, foll.

him

him what she could do, he at once said, "Send for Lord Palmerston, who is the only man in the present temper of the people and state of affairs who can form a Government that has a chance of standing. Send for him at once, place yourself entirely in his hands, "give him your entire confidence, and I will answer for his conduct being all that you can desire." The Queen took the advice, and has had no reason to repent of it, and Clarendon told me he had done everything in his power, and seized every available opportunity to reconcile them to each other, to promote a good feeling and understanding, and to soften any little asperities which might have made their intercourse less smooth, and the consequence is that Palmerston gets on with her very well, and his good sense as well as Clarendon's exhortations make him see of what importance it is to him for the easy working of his Government and his own ease to be on good and cordial terms with the Queen. It is therefore really to Clarendon that Palmerston is indebted in great measure, if not entirely, for being in his present position, but Clarendon has too much tact ever to remind him of it.—Greville (Third Part), vol. ii. p. 64.

The Queen recognized Lord Palmerston's ability and popularity; and although he was so far from commanding a majority that he could not even be called the leader of a party, she invited him as the most popular man in the country to assume the leadership of the Liberal party, and the responsibility of administration. How far this course was in accordance with the strict spirit of Parliamentary government may be a question. The practical wisdom of it was proved by the event; and all men admired the lofty disregard of personal predilection, and the absolute forgetfulness of former grounds of disapproval which the Sovereign showed in pursuit of her purpose to do the best for the interests of her people.

At first most of the Peelites remained in the new Cabinet, but this was only for a few days. By the end of February the Ministry had been completely remodelled, and the Peelite party went out of office only to re-enter it as a small fragment in the multitudinous host which welcomed Lord Palmerston back to power in 1859. It was the singular fortune of the eminent men who claimed to be the disciples of Sir Robert Peel, that their brief triumph of 1853 and 1854 not only plunged the country into a bloody war, but secured the life-long supremacy of the man whose policy they had most constantly and bitterly assailed.

If we turn to Mr. Walpole for some account of the dramatic transfer of power from Aberdeen to Palmerston, we get few dates and the following valuable information:—

'The famous apothegm of Tacitus was applicable to Aberdeen, and the best Foreign Secretary of the century might have been regarded

regarded as worthy of rule if he had not, for an evil hour for his reputation, become Prime Minister. Forced by the strong men under him into a policy which he disapproved, he was never able to throw his heart into the war in which he had reluctantly engaged. Yet a fair critic, instead of condemning the Minister, will, perhaps, applaud the man. The faults which Aberdeen committed as a statesman were not far removed from the virtues of private life.'—Walpole, vol. v. p. 127.

Aberdeen the best Foreign Ministry of the century! Better, that is to say, than Canning, Wellington, Palmerston, Clarendon, Salisbury. Such is the value of Mr. Walpole's judgment on foreign affairs.

Mr. Greville's *Journal* runs on to 1860, and it is very agreeable reading to the last. Space does not allow us to examine in detail his contributions to the history of the second Derby and the second Palmerston administration. We have many glimpses of Mr. Gladstone and of the way in which the coming leader of the Liberal party was regarded by his future subjects. Writing after the fall of Aberdeen, Mr. Greville describes the relations between Gladstone and his successor at the Exchequer:—

'Gladstone seems bent on leading Sir George Lewis a weary life, but Lewis is just the man to encounter and baffle such an opponent, for he is cold-blooded as a fish, totally devoid of sensibility or nervousness, of an imperturbable temper, calm and resolute, laborious and indefatigable, and exceedingly popular in the House of Commons from his general good humour and civility, and the credit given him for honour, sincerity, plain dealing, and good intentions.'—Greville (*Third Part*), vol. ii. p. 84.

It is not uninteresting to compare this sketch of Lewis with Lewis's estimate of Gladstone a few years later, when they were colleagues in the second Palmerston Cabinet:—

'Gladstone, George Lewis evidently distrusts, and his financial schemes and arrangements are as distasteful to him as possible. He is provoked at Gladstone's being able to bear down all opposition, and carry all before him by the force of his eloquence and power of words, and what I have said of his conduct in supporting John Russell is still more applicable to it in reference to Gladstone and his measures, which he thinks more dangerous by far than he does Lord John's Reform Bill and 6l. clause.'—Greville (*Third Part*), vol. ii. p. 304.

We have another note on Gladstone, evidently expressing the views of Clarendon:—

'He has not failed to show a little of the cloven foot, and to alarm people as to his future designs. Clarendon, who watches him, and has means of knowing his disposition, thinks that he is moving towards a Democratic union with Bright, the effect of which will be increased

increased Income Tax and lowering the estimates by giving up the defences of the country, to which Sidney Herbert will never consent, and already these old friends and colleagues appear to be fast getting into a state of antagonism. Aberdeen told Clarendon that they would never go on together, and he thought Sidney Herbert would retire from the Cabinet before the end of the session. This, of course, implies that Gladstone's policy is to be in the ascendant, and that he is to override the Cabinet.'—Greville (Third Part), vol. ii. pp. 293, 294.

Shortly afterwards he writes: 'Clarendon wrote to me when I was at Bath, that the time would probably come when Gladstone would propose a graduated income tax.' It is not, however, from that able Minister, but from his brother that Greville gives us the most remarkable view of the man who was destined to exercise for the next generation so baleful an influence on English public life:—

'I met Charles Villiers at dinner at the Traveller's last night and had some talk with him, particularly about Gladstone. He thinks it far better that he should not resign, as he could, and probably would, be very mischievous out of office. He says people do not know the House of Commons, and are little aware that there is an obscure but important element in it of a Radical complexion, and that there are sixty or seventy people who would constitute themselves followers of Gladstone and urge him on to every sort of mischief. They are already doing all they can to flatter and cajole him, and once out of office, his great talents and oratorical powers would make him courted by all parties, even the Tories, who would each and all be very glad to enlist him in their service. It is impossible to calculate on the course of a man so variable and impulsive, but at present it looks as if he had made up his mind to swallow his mortifications and disappointments and to go on with his present colleagues, though Charles Villiers says he is very dejected and uneasy in his mind, and very gloomy in the Cabinet.'—Greville (Third Part), vol. ii. pp. 312-313.

The period these volumes cover seems remote, viewed through the storm and conflict of the twenty years which followed on the death of Palmerston. The picture they present of the decline of a great historic party will make this sense of remoteness more strong to our readers, who have witnessed the restoration of patriotism and public spirit achieved by the energy of Lord Hartington and the other leaders of the Liberal-Unionists in the great struggle of last year; but the course of events we have referred to goes far to explain that long servitude to demagoguery, from which we hope the Liberal party have now been definitely released. No political organization can exist with credit to itself, or advantage to the country, as the Whigs endeavoured to do from 1835 to 1855, without avowed principles or a definite policy.

- ART. IX.—1. *England's Case against Home Rule.* By A. V. Dicey, B.C.L. Third Edition. London, 1887.
2. *Why England maintains the Union.* Being the substance of 'England's Case Against Home Rule.' By Professor A. V. Dicey, prepared for popular use by C.E.S. London, 1887.
3. *Industrial Ireland.* By Robert Dennis, London, 1887.
4. *Ireland's Progress, 1782-1800-1886.* Dublin, 1886.
5. *The Law of the Land.* An Address delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution at the opening of its Session, November, 1886. By E. J. Phelps.
6. *The Irish Question: a Reply to Mr. Gladstone.* By Thos. E. Webb, LL.D. London and Dublin, 1886.
7. *'As it Was Said.'* Speeches by the Parnellite Party. London, 1886.
8. *Parnellism and Crime.* Reprinted from the 'Times.' London, 1887.
9. *A Bill to make better Provision for the Prevention and Punishment of Crime in Ireland, and for the other purposes relating thereto.* Read a first time in House of Commons, April 2, 1887.

HOME Rule is the fanatic Irishman's political Messiah, constantly expected, but that never comes. It is to be the general substitute for individual energy and industry, for mutual confidence, habitual forbearance, and for application, prudence, and resource. Thus enthusiasm dreams. But there also is in Ireland abundance of fanaticism of a wholly different kind; of calculating selfishness, and practical dishonesty, and even murderous greed. Just debts and self-imposed responsibilities are to be repudiated, rents are to cease, arrears to be withheld, landlords and not tenants are to be evicted when the rents are overdue, and the hard-hearted debtor is to take the place of his humiliated creditor. There is to be no question of ability to pay, but only of the will, and this will is not to be the tenant's own, but that of a low demagogic combination, urged by class vindictiveness and spite. This malignant Plan has been contrived by Mr. Gladstone's present masters; and they use it as an irritant, to excite the fading and dishonest hopes of the deluded tenantry of Ireland.

At Ballyhaunis, for example, Mr. Dillon told the tenants that their only will, their duty paramount is to obey. 'The National League intended to lay down a law that on estates where the rents were rack rents they should allow no man to sell his interest; for the man who sold his interest in a rack-rented estate, and allowed a man of means, or man of trade, to come in, was one of the tenants' greatest enemies.'

Thus warned that their chief business is to mind the instructions of the League and not their own affairs, the tenants on some suitable estate are ordered to demand a general proportionate abatement of their rents, much overdue. They probably might sell their interests to some 'man of means,' and so obtain a little capital for further enterprise; the larger capital that is so needed for the efficient cultivation of the land would also thus be gained. Here there would be for all concerned fair, beneficial trade; and this would probably result in honest solvency throughout the whole estate. But that is not the object of the League. The man of means is not the slave of agitators; he must be kept out, that the impoverished tenants may remain, to be the means of further agitation, and more plunder for the emissaries of the League.

Each Irish tenant has of course, in law and equity, to pay the rent agreed for with the landlord or allotted by the Government Commission; and this rent unpaid becomes a common statutory debt, for which the tenant's whole estate and goods are legally responsible. The tenant's bargain may have been most fortunately timed for him, as prices might be going up; yet when these prices rise, the landlord gets no rise of rent; and similarly, on the other hand, when markets change adversely, the ground landlord will not be affected, but the tenant's liability remains. The tenant when he takes the land employs it as a raw material; and if his finished article is valueless, the landlord is not to be made to bear the tenant's loss. Suppose the tenant had, instead of hiring, bought the land outright, and then had failed and lost his time and capital, this would afford no reason for a claim against the late proprietor for restitution, wholly or in part, of the amount that had been given for the estate. And letting is, in fact and equity, but selling for a term; with payment made in parcels, and deferred. The tenant, in a business point of view, has no claim at all against the landlord. He would never think of offering the landlord any share of unexpected or uncalculated gains; and so when he has losses he must bear them, with no expectation that some human providence will intervene. Undoubtedly the Irish tenant may, like tenants in this country, make a dignified appeal for favour and relief; and a good landlord who has ample means would take the matter into generous consideration; and if the honest man's affairs are suffering unbearably from undue rental, a reduction might be equitably made.

But then the landlord also has to be considered. He himself may be in circumstances of some difficulty; and, considering how of late he has been treated, this is very probable. Though quite

quite willing, he may have no power or right to make the abatement that the tenant seeks; or he may be unable to regard the matter wholly as the tenant sees it, and may possibly refuse the application. Thus, for instance, recently, 'a correspondence between Lord Lansdowne's agent and the Rev. T. Kehoe, P.P., and others assuming to be speakers for the Queen's County tenants, shows that his Excellency is not disposed to make indiscriminate abatements of the judicial rents. The rev. gentleman wrote to say that the tenants had expected that Lord Lansdowne would make reductions in the Queen's County similar to those that he had made in Kerry. Mr. Trench, Lord Lansdowne's agent, in reply, remarks that the communication has three other signatures attached to it in the same handwriting as that of the rev. gentleman; and says that in giving to the tenants on Lord Lansdowne's Queen's County estates an abatement that varies from ten to twenty-five per cent., his Excellency regarded their circumstances as very different from those of his tenants in Kerry. The class of stock produced in the Queen's County is superior to what can be produced in Kerry, and the farming generally ought to be less affected by the depression in prices. Lord Lansdowne recently endeavoured to improve the agricultural condition of his tenants. These efforts had been cordially responded to by his Kerry tenantry, whereas they had been almost contemptuously disregarded by his tenants in the Queen's County, the leaders of whom seemed to regard an abatement of rent as the only method of improving the condition of the people that was worthy of a moment's consideration.'

This is an illustrative case; there has been precisely that liberality and consideration that an English landlord will exhibit to his tenants. The abatement of rental was quite freely offered, and there had not then been any combination to resist the landlord's claim. In England, where the sense of legal right is interwoven with a sentiment of mutual generosity in the commercial character and social habits of the nation, such abatement is most sympathetically given, and is thankfully and honourably received.

In Ireland, unhappily, the business habits of the agricultural population are not English; and transactions of this reasonable kind are not so well appreciated beyond St. George's Channel. There, their foreign garb, it seems, might be objected to. But, none the less, until the English method, with its strict regard for contracts and its equitable moderation, is adopted by all classes of the Irish people, they will always be impoverished and discontented. Even with the amplest measure of Home Rule there would be no abatement of their misery.

The Irish notion of the relative positions of two parties to a contract has, indeed, become ridiculous. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin says: 'It is admitted on all hands that practically over Ireland large reductions are to be made, even in the judicial rents. The question is as to the amount of those reductions. Whatever inconvenience there may be in having that grave question decided by the tenants, there is just the same, or even in one way much greater inconvenience in having it decided by the landlords. The landlord, like the tenant, is now merely one of two contracting parties.' Now, 'practically' is not absolutely over Ireland, and each landlord may declare that his estate must practically be exempted; and, as 'one of two contracting parties,' he may very properly decline to sacrifice his portion of advantage in the contract. Again, if a reduction must be made, it is absurd that he who breaks the contract should have power to decide against the other party to the covenant, not merely that the contract shall be broken, but how far the fracture shall extend. In business, when legitimately done, the party failing in his contract must surrender all his property and goods to satisfy his creditor; and as land farming is a business, not a sentimental enterprise, whichever of the two contracting parties fails, the other, or the Court of Bankruptcy, will of course decide what payment, less than the whole sum due, will be accepted. The Archbishop's notion, that the debtor is to be the judge and regulator of his own indebtedness, is very Irish indeed. It shows distinctly what a mixture of the greedy child and the illogical barbarian a leading Irishman may be. How can a people so devoid of equity be fit for any kind of rule?

In the new Irish method of Campaign commercial principles and sentiments of honour have no place. There may among the tenants of a large estate be some who are in real trouble, probably through idleness or want of thrift, or sheer stupidity induced by vain political excitement, or yet possibly from some misfortune. But all tenants, even on a small estate, can hardly be just equally unfortunate; there must be a difference; and on most estates there are at least some tenants who could pay. Again, the tenants on each separate estate are not a corporate body who have taken all the land in one large holding. Each man is a separate holder, separately liable; and the landlord may quite properly refuse to recognize a mass of tenants, where in fact he let the land to each man individually. To each tenant, therefore, he would make such fair abatement as that tenant seemed to need.

But this would never suit the Irish League; this resolute
and

and reasonable plan is far too peaceable for them. Their object is to keep the country in perpetual turmoil; and there must be insolence, injustice, spite, and swagger, to induce retaliation, and to make the business useful for their predatory enterprise. Men able and inclined to pay are terrorized, men able and not willing are immorally supported; and they all, by promises or threats, are made the tools of agitators for the objects of the league. At Castlereagh, Mr. John Dillon said: 'I tell these people that the time is at hand, and very close at hand too, when the police will be our servants, when the police will be taking their pay from Mr. Parnell, when he will be Prime Minister of Ireland. And I warn the men to-day who take their stand by the side of landlordism, and I signalize them as the enemies of the people, that in the time of our power we will remember them.' The same amiable gentleman, adopting now a different tone, 'put it to the wretched tenants round Ballyhaunis what they would suffer if evicted for adopting the Plan of Campaign? Would they not be better off with thirty shillings or two pounds a week, with their hands in their pockets, amusing themselves, instead of living in miserable cabins, delving and digging, as at present, for the benefit of the landlords?' And, on the same occasion, Mr. P. McDonald, M.P., 'was authorized by the National League to state, that the tenants who followed the lines laid down for them would be paid far more than they could make by the profits of their labourers on their farms.'

In case the landlord hesitates to recognize the combination, or to grant what the Land League instructs the tenants to demand, the tenants are invited, or by threats like those of Mr. Dillon are compelled, to pay to some one nominated by the League their several rents, less the abatement that they, in conference with the League, may have decided on. Of these agents one is Mr. Wm. O'Brien, editor of 'United Ireland;' and at Inchiquin he said: 'thousands of poor western farmers scraped together the amount of their deposits; many of them, to my own knowledge, by begging and by borrowing it. And in absolutely unquestioning confidence they handed over their little store to me, a stranger to them, whose worldly goods are all compressed in two portmanteaus.' This aggregate of fragmentary rents becomes a fund by which the landlord may be met when he proceeds at law; but where or when the unexpended balance will be found, time possibly may never show. The tenants are, however, by this plan put absolutely in the power of the League, to do its will, however much against their own; and, consequently, all that tenants have from that time to expect

expect from any resolute and solvent landlord will be more ejectment notices and more evictions.

The plan is bold and clever, but, if the Government is firm and wise, immeasurably foolish; and it will be terribly injurious to the people whom it is designed to benefit. Its object is, besides political excitement, to depreciate the rent of land by terrorizing those who willingly would take it at the actual, or something like the actual rent; and then by means of this depreciated rental to maintain the indolent and helpless tenant in his miserable, half-cultivated holding. Nothing can be worse for the prosperity of Ireland. What is wanted throughout Ireland is free competition, that will tend to regular improvement in the cultivation of the land. Low rents, unduly low, have been the bane of agriculture. Ignorant, unenterprising, stupid fellows, holding small farms at low rents, are agricultural obstructives, and they can be traced throughout the country by their ample crops of weeds. In Scotland forty years ago, the rents were low, and farming was low also. Rents have since that time been raised, with benefit alike to landlord, tenant, and the land. The Irish plan is the reverse of this, involving injury not merely to the agriculture of the country, but to its whole condition, economical, political, and social. The Land League is worked by men, mere agitating politicians with 'portmanteaus,' who know nothing of political or agricultural economy. Their undertaking is indeed unspeakably absurd. Of what use is the land if wealth, to avoid the nuisance of a howling agitation, seconded by cruelty and murder, constantly retreats from Ireland? The Irish, it is clear, cannot compete abroad in agricultural produce with the Canadians, or the Punjaubees, with the Argentine Republic, or, it seems, with France, or Germany, or Denmark. All these markets crush them; yet the Irish drive away the wealth that might develop industry and give them a most lucrative home market of their own. What Irishmen most need is not the land, but wealth to make the land worth having; and this wealth they are, by their wild raving and disorder, driving from the country. A fine foretaste of Home Rule!

Some two months since, at Ennis, 'Mr. Justice O'Brien, in the course of his charge to the grand jury, gave his fellow-countrymen some good advice. After expressing in the strongest language his horror at the murder of Byers, and the inhuman treatment of his widow, and asserting that "law had to a great extent ceased to exist in the country," he reminded his hearers how much individual Irishmen could and ought to do independently of the assistance of the Government, to rescue their

their country from its present condition. "Let those persons who are engaged in trade see the ruin that is before their eyes; let those who have to meet their own engagements and cannot collect their debts support each other." Mr. Justice O'Brien expressed his belief, that the tyranny now existing in Ireland could not stand a day against an earnest combination of all those to whom it is hateful, if they would only have the courage to combine.'

Like most untutored people, Irish peasants are strict absolutists. Judgment, conciliation, compromise, and equity, are not to be expected of them. Thus, in dealing with the landlords they are sometimes servile, sometimes insolent; and in their discussions about land, even among relatives, there is a bitterness and spite that to an Englishman seems very paltry and degrading. Irish landlords also are not altogether free from this peculiar excitability. Tenants and landlords are too often mutually hostile and suspicious, rather than considerate and helpful; and even among neighbouring occupiers of the land there is much jealousy, unfriendliness, and sometimes even open war. Land questions, owing chiefly to the dual tenure, are a permanent disease in Ireland, and scheming agitators make it their chief business to excite the uninstructed peasantry into a state of mixed rebellion and dishonesty; and so to keep them, as a means of urging on their further schemes of selfishness and plunder.

In the eyes of certain solvent tenants the League Plan has one especial merit. If successful it would gain for them a pleasant saving of their comfortable balance at the bank, or store of bank notes in 'the thatch;' since, if the bankrupt tenants are to be sufficiently relieved, the solvent tenants, with the same percentage of abatement, will receive a perfectly gratuitous allowance; and the Plan of equally proportioned rebate given to all must thus be curiously inequitable. But this again is Irish. The people are like children at a play. A scheme looks fair, and for the moment that is all they care for.

The equal, 'fair,' and indiscriminating gift of favours is in Ireland the recognized, established plan. In times of famine and distress, when help is sent to Ireland, it is asked for, or demanded, not alone by those in abject poverty of means, but also by a class, not small, whose poverty is merely that of spirit and of honour; who by studious deceit and whining mendicancy, or by insolence and threats, all curiously connived at by their really needy neighbours, can obtain a share of the restricted dole. And so they systematically rob the poor. Such men are
also

also very loud in favour of Home Rule. They see how beneficial to the Irish rascal Irish government might be.

Such mendicancy by the well-to-do is made comparatively easy and successful by the little difference there is in the external aspect of the Irish cottages. Display of wealth is not the weakness of an Irish agriculturist. Indeed he seeks to hide his talent. Thus a doctor calling on a farmer for the payment of his bill was met by the habitual plea of poverty, and a request that the account might be a charge upon the parish. This was refused; and, after many lies, at length a handful of bank notes was found, not one of which was small enough to settle the account.

The present Irish Campaign has the advantage of the tacit or the open sanction of the followers of Mr. Gladstone; and no circumstance in English politics during the last half century has given so much cause for apprehension and anxiety as the reserve of the leaders of the English Separatists on this roguish Plan. Home Rule itself is but a trifle to it. The silent sanction given to this Plan implies the moral degradation of our politicians; and there is a reasonable fear that, by the influence and example of these public men, the established character of Englishmen for honesty and rectitude may be endangered.

Unfortunately, more than once or twice already, Parliament, in dealing with the land, has paid for so-called justice by some beautifully simple fraud. The Encumbered Estates Act of Sir Robert Peel inflicted horrible injustice on the tenants, who were evicted by the purchasers of the estates without acknowledgment or proper payment for their permanent expenditure. And the two more recent Land Acts have been, as a quasi-moral set-off possibly, a confiscation of the landlords' properties. By these hasty Acts the Government and nation, led by Mr. Gladstone, 'conscientiously' performed some artful feats of fiscal dodging; making also a great demonstration of benevolence at other people's cost, which is so comforting and satisfactory. But the evil of this method soon appeared; and while intending to relieve the tenants Mr. Gladstone has inflicted on them the peculiar misery of fixed dual tenure. The aggressive sympathy that causes all this injury is the mean sympathy of weak benevolence; the sympathy of greed of power with the greed of pelf. An Act of Parliament may be found a short way with a difficulty, but it may increase the trouble rather than diminish it; and Irish tenants and their landlords are now held together, not united, by a most intolerable chain, which must with energetic expedition be got rid of.

In

In the Liberal party, Mr. Gladstone's recent policy appears to show, that right and wrong are terms that for political expediency may be convertible. Thus, when at Leeds some few years since, and speaking as a Unionist, Mr. Gladstone told his audience that 'although in America the Irish party were publishing literature which urged assassination, Mr. Parnell never repudiated the doctrine of his party.' This was very wrong of Mr. Parnell, and Mr. Gladstone's conscience was of course afflicted, and his indignation was aroused. But with Mr. Gladstone, 'what you make it the interest of a man to do, that he will do.' At Leeds he hoped, in his own sanguine way, to get a Liberal majority sufficient to outvote the Home Rulers and Conservatives combined; but now he has joined forces with the men whose aims at roguery and treason he had formerly denounced. He has become their friend, their drudge in Parliament, and their obsequious ally. He has no word to say in condemnation of their plan of terror and embezzlement; but he accounts for it by saying, that a similarly fraudulent proposal made by his new leader, who was formerly denounced as an associate or fellow-worker with assassins, had not been accepted by the House.

In England public men are valued very much according to the worth of their admirers, of the men whom they expressly represent. The followers of Messrs. Patrick Ford and Patrick Egan, Daniel Curley, J. G. Biggar and James Carey, Charles S. Parnell and Joseph Brady, were of course well represented by those gentlemen; and Mr. Gladstone with great perspicuity and vigour told us—when he hoped to do without their aid—of their designs of rapine and dismemberment. The connection of the Irish Parliamentary leaders and their recognized subordinates with schemes and acts of cruelty and murder of the most revolting kinds has been clearly proved, as every one may see, in the small pamphlet on 'Parnellism and Crime,' published by the 'Times' newspaper. Mr. Gladstone now follows the instructions of that portion of the lovely group that were not hanged; and must be estimated in accordance with his new position and relationship. It is a pitiful display, a terrible debasement for a man who thrice has been Prime Minister. At his age men of wisdom seek to pacify and calm contentious spirits, to be moderators among men, to use their influence for union and for mutual forbearance. It is lamentable that, when near the end of his career, the former Prime Minister has by 'impulse,' and without judicious thought or tentative discussion, placed himself in violent antagonism to the intellectual power and the independent culture of the nation. His position at the tail of the rebellious group in Parliament

is

is humiliating and ridiculous. The Irish Home Rule members represent the lowest class of the constituency ; and it is believed that half of them are paid from the subscriptions of the enemies of England. And yet Mr. Gladstone ventures to assume that his proposals, thus supported, are consistent with patriotism, and would be approved of by the Liberal party. He does not seem to see, how many of his followers have neither knowledge nor opinion of the slightest value on the subject, who are sent to Parliament for every cause or reason that could be described, save that of their political experience or science ; so inferior a set of men has never heretofore been seen among the Liberal members. Others of them are political adventurers, whose first desire is office, and its pay ; who loudly laud their leader, so that he shall hear, and at elections use his name to catch stray votes ; self-seekers, 'men of business' they are called, whose eager looks and bustling demonstrations are so curious to witness. 'They will never abandon their great leader ;' and unfortunately Mr. Gladstone is beguiled by this poor adulation. Thus, in their selfish generation, these adventurers are wise ; for Mr. Gladstone is a lavish giver of good things in recognition of political support. He, it is true, has been exceedingly severe upon the satisfaction given to Irish claimants on the passing of the Act of Union ; but, considering all things, and particularly the increased responsibility of politicians to the public, Mr. Gladstone's cheerful gifts of various kinds for parliamentary and partisan assistance are much more to be regretted than the payments and the peerages that Lord Cornwallis so unwillingly and even scrupulously made. Mr. Gladstone is 'amazed at the deadness of vulgar opinion to the blackguardism and baseness which befoul the whole history of the Union.' But when did his own opinion cease to be 'amazing and dead' ? Has he been for sixty years or more a person of 'vulgar opinion' ; not caring or not daring to declare his hidden sentiments, but scolding and imprisoning the men who held the same opinion that he now so suddenly avows ? With prudent statesmen present evil is sufficient for the day. Professor Dicey has observed, that 'the rhetorical emphasis laid by Home Rulers on the baseness of the arts which carried the Act of Union is, as an argument in favour of repealing the Act, little else than irrational. The assumed infamy of Pitt does not prove the alleged wisdom of Gladstone ; and to urge the repeal of an Act which has stood for nearly a century, because it was carried by corruption, is in the eye of reason as absurd as to question the title of modern French landowners because of the horrors of the Reign of Terror.'

Mr. Gladstone's

Mr. Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule has had no obvious historical development. The fact that he, so unexpectedly, discovered that he had no working majority, led him to see that Home Rule had supporters who might help him in his need; and that to gain their eighty votes he merely had to say a word or two of invitation. His great, very needless fear was, lest his adversaries should anticipate him or outbid him; and by this urgent fear his conscience suddenly became aroused. An eager proselyte, he used harsh language to denounce the faith that he so recently had left; and his new friends, whose footsteps crime had dogged persistently when they were his opponents, and whom he accused of patronizing robbery and treason, now became the subjects of his wordy compliments, and of his grateful, laudatory recognition. Embezzlement and terrorism, organized by his new masters and admirers, meet with no indignant reprobation. They appear to be regarded, like the Clerkenwell and Manchester atrocities, as useful political inducements. But when those for whose behoof in any sense a crime has been committed fail to denounce it, they are in a corresponding bad position with accessories after the fact, or with receivers, who are worse than thieves. And Mr. Gladstone now is in precisely the position for which those who are his present colleagues were condemned by him at Leeds.

The members of his Government, who made such foolish haste to be converted when they found that Mr. Gladstone had entirely changed his mind, have hardly saved their reputations. Every one of them is lowered, some indeed most fatally in popular esteem. There are, of course, distinctions; and Lord Spencer is a serious, trustworthy gentleman, whom few would wish to blame. But as a contrast, not quite picturesque, Sir William Harcourt is a merely party politician, with no obvious regard for principle. A very Hector, when he thinks he is quite safe, but who, when collared, sinks into his shoes; whom, therefore, no one cares for. Others of the party have by ratting, at the order of their conscientious leader, from their own proclaimed convictions, lost whatever reputation they once had; and they are nothing. But the late Irish Secretary has his own established credit as a man of letters. When he, therefore, as a statesman pointedly repudiates the duty of condemning the Plan of Campaign, he trifles with his good repute, as well as with the welfare of the State. If Mr. Morley now elects to join a company in which this Plan is one chief means of action, he of course will understand that literary men of honour find their moral sentiments and feelings outraged by the exhibition of such sympathy, however passive, with injustice. The whole

whole of our financial, social, and political condition has its firm foundation in the law; and for a statesman to reserve his judgment on a systematic, persevering violation of the right, because the rogues pretend to have political opinions very like his own, is condonation of injustice. There can be no reserve here on the part of English gentlemen. Irish ideas of this kind are not to be admitted by our literary men in Parliament without unqualified, indignant protest from the literary world. No compromise of right and wrong can be accepted; and, in presence of this wrong accomplished by conspiracy, the silence of a Privy Councillor is equally a wrong. 'When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him.'

The Separatist party evidently have no special knowledge about Ireland or Irish affairs. Until Mr. Gladstone found salvation, they were almost all opponents of Home Rule, and voted for the Union. When, however, Mr. Gladstone changed his politics, they all turned tail, abandoned their defence of the United Kingdom, and with no more care than if it were a local highway Bill, they blindly, or like simple devotees, without preliminary information or debate, accepted a proposal that to them, in its immediate effect as well as in its subsequent results, was utterly inscrutable; and which, in its actual form, was the most puerile as well as the most revolutionary project that had ever been submitted to the judgment—or the folly—of the British nation.

This is a warning; and 'the classes,' those who have been educated to the level of capacity for scientific thought, should promptly take the warning. Not, however, as a note of apprehension or of fear, but as a stimulus to active, unremitting work. We all trust Englishmen—and would trust Irishmen—when they completely understand the matter about which their judgment and their feelings are invoked and exercised. The policy and future of the country, therefore, are distinctly in the hands of those who are the wise among us. Being wise they will, with energetic wisdom, teach and stimulate the uninformed and listless; not opposing merely the vain ignorance of unintelligent democracy, but utterly destroying it by careful and assiduous instruction. This great national enlightenment is very urgently required. In England we have now in most constituencies a numerous illiterate class, who are allowed to vote because, as it is said, the franchise tends to educate the voters. But in Ireland the condition of the electors who send eighty Nationalists, or more, to Parliament, is even worse. One-fifth of them, in some constituencies one-half, can neither read nor write their names; and the literature of those who do read is not calculated to fit them
either

either for Home Rule or rule of any kind. The Irish people are a natural result of what they feed on, and are subject to a constant monomania on political affairs. An Irishman may give up whiskey, and his pipe, but, as he says, he must be busy with 'the politics.' Throughout the history of Ireland the persistent sectional and party feeling of the several factions has been the chief subject of contemporary records. The obstructive tactics of the Irish members in the British Parliament continue the historical disease; they are a local phase of the disorder, and result from the demands and influence of men who deal in murder and conspiracy; who find the funds to send peculiar specimens of Irishmen to Parliament, and to keep them there. Thus the chief tendency of Irish agitation has been to degrade the public character and aspirations of the Irish people, and to make the late proposals for Home Rule especially repugnant to the sentiments of honourable Englishmen.

But Ireland under the united government is steadily improving. With our abundant and cheap news we hear much more than formerly of the disorders there; but those who still remember the condition of the country fifty years ago can tell of outrages far more abundant and more terrible than now.* But though the country is advancing, yet the advance, save in the North of Ireland, is slow; and neither legislative independence, which would be sheer foolish retrogression, nor the dissolution of the dual ownerships, which would be perfect wisdom, would do all the expected, necessary good. There may be very great improvement in the state of Ireland, and yet many of the Irish would be discontented; and indeed were Ireland satisfied in everything respecting land and legislation, still a large proportion of the people would maintain their hostile tone to England. For this reason, that in England we are stronger, richer, and in most things better off than Irishmen.

We are unable to notice all the important works placed at the head of the present article; but we would call particular attention to Professor Dicey's very clear, convincing statement of 'England's Case against Home Rule.' The substance of the book has been republished for more general circulation under the title, 'Why England maintains the Union.' Mr. Dicey claims, with perfect justness, that he has conducted his argument 'without any appeal to prejudice, passion, or sentiment, and with the calmness and fairness which a scientific constitu-

* 'DREADFUL STATE OF IRELAND.—At length the state of Ireland appears to have stricken the minds of our rulers with awe; and coercive measures are said to be in contemplation for immediate adoption.'—*Kentish Paper*, January 24, 1833.

tionalist should display in weighing the merits of any alteration in our form of government.' Having unanswerably proved that Home Rule, as explained and advocated recently by Mr. Gladstone, is an impossible scheme, and that the only choice is between the maintenance of the Union and the concession to Ireland of national independence, he points out three main evils which would attend the latter alternative:

'I. It would in the first place be a complete surrender of the objects we have aimed at for centuries, and an abdication of authority such as no powerful nation can make without real discredit. Such a surrender, if wrung from a nation by the force of crushing defeat, may indeed be a sign or a cause of weakness, but need involve no disgrace. The Austrians, the French, the Danes, and the Dutch, and we ourselves in America, have all in turn lost territory without loss of credit. Each of these nations in turn was beaten, as one of the parties to a fight must be beaten; but each had struggled manfully to maintain its power, and had betrayed none of those failings which encourage further attack. But a deliberate and unforced surrender of authority would be a very different thing. It could be made without loss of our own self-respect or of the respect of other nations, on one condition only. That condition would be, the united conviction of the whole English people that justice required the grant of independence to Ireland.

'No such conviction exists, or is ever likely to exist. The English sense of duty tells the other way. Could we even consider the idea of separation as desirable on grounds of expediency, it would still be hard to persuade the nation that there was not vile treachery in deserting that part of the Irish people which desired to remain united to us; and that there would not be something approaching even to infamy if England, for the sake of her own comfort, should abandon subjects, who have obeyed her laws, relying upon her honour for their protection, to the mercy of conspirators whose lawlessness had taken the form of cruelty and tyranny, and under whose rule they would assuredly suffer for their former loyalty to England.

'II. Separation would mean a loss to Great Britain both in money and men. The loss in money would not, perhaps, be very serious. It appears to be estimated by Mr. Gladstone, probably not unfairly, at about three-and-a-half millions per annum. But the sacrifice of a seventh part of our population would be no light matter. The bravery, the capacity, and the genius of Irishmen, whether as labourers, soldiers, generals, or statesmen, have assuredly rendered no trifling services to the British Crown. It is, however, happily beyond the reach of political revolutions to dissolve, or greatly to injure, ties of kindred, business, friendship, and affection, and depending upon community of language, of interest, and of feeling. A generous and a just extension of the privileges of citizenship might fill the British army and Civil Service with Irishmen, even after Ireland had become independent. It would, in any case, depend
upon

upon the wisdom of Great Britain whether separation should or should not mean estrangement.

III. Separation would give England a foreign, and possibly a hostile, neighbour on her western coasts. In time of war Ireland might ally herself with our enemies; in time of peace she might embarrass our diplomacy. We should have to increase our army when we had lost our best recruiting ground, and we should, sooner or later, be driven, like all Continental States, to the ruinous resource of conscription. The only nations with which Ireland could combine against us are America and France. The notion of Ireland ever becoming a part of the American Union is the wildest of dreams; but the possibility of an Irish alliance with France is a different matter. An alliance between France and Ireland would no doubt be a help to France in attacking us.'

Such are the cogent arguments against Home Rule. But while accepting them in all their force, with resolution to maintain the Union, there must be a corresponding resolute determination to secure for Ireland, for Irishmen of all classes and conditions, both protective government and equitable law, and to remove, by special legislation, the peculiar evils which afflict the Irish people. Knowledge and sympathy are the equipments first required to insure success in a campaign against the miseries of Ireland; and knowledge, not scholastic only, or that may be culled from newspapers and travel talk, but a detailed and practical acquaintance with the country, with the economical and social, ethical and intellectual condition of the people, and with the nature and the capabilities and products of the soil. The sympathy must also be not merely parliamentary and remote, but intimate and personal, with care for the development of trade and commerce. There must be an English mission of strong-minded men to intercede with and to help the antagonistic Irish classes, to compose their differences, and to combine the people for the advancement of the nation; moderators, who by wise counsel would persuade all Irishmen to help instead of harming one another.

The Irish are untrained, and have for centuries been neglected; and, to make up for lost time, their training may be best effected by the help of English energy, and patience, and devotion. It may be said that these would be unwelcome to the Irish themselves. Quite possibly; but the 'devotion' makes this possibility of no importance. There must be a migration of intelligent and personal beneficence from England into Ireland. Not alone paid emissaries, but the class of English gentlemen, whose independence, mental power, forbearing kindliness, and social culture, will commend themselves

selves to Irishmen. There is a notion, that the Irish people are most difficult to lead ; a glance at those who are their present leaders should suffice to rectify this error. No people in the world are more completely trustful and confiding. Their own local gentry and superiors in rank have lost much of the influence that once appeared to be their heritage and right. The change is greatly due to questions about land, and to the oft-occurring bankruptcy of land proprietors. The similarity of temperament in the people and the squires also tended to friction ; and, when interests appeared to be antagonistic, there came heat and fire. With Englishmen in numbers sympathizing with Irish wants and aspirations, the excited, irritated sensibilities of each antagonistic class would be allayed, and the intelligence of the people could then be fairly used. The assistance of their English neighbours, who are some two hundred years before them in both wealth and economic culture, would be quickly felt, and not without appreciation. Men thus beneficent would soon be recognized as friends and leaders of the Irish people ; whose old enmity for their neighbours would be lost in the regard of Irishmen for those who had by their wise liberality and thoughtful kindness gained their confidence ; and had enabled them to rise in character and wealth and reasonable hope.

A project thus apart from Parliament, and undertaking that which Parliament for centuries has failed to do, will hardly be regarded favourably by the House of Commons. And yet such a project, suitably developed, is essential to the safety and continuance of the British Empire. England has by commerce and by arms extended a dominion that surpasses all that have been known in the world's history. But if henceforth it should depend on arms and commerce only, even with the rule of law and justice, to preserve the *Pax Britannica*, disruption of the Empire is inevitable. By might and interest we may hold, with insecurity, what we have gained ; but then we shall be forced to hold it as one holds a mastiff by the ears ; our hands will be completely occupied. Unless we cordially sympathize with all the various races that are subject to our rule, and also gain their sympathy, our strength will not increase, but will diminish, in proportion to the progress of these races and communities in general prosperity ; and thus Majuba Hill, with variations, may be more than once repeated.

In 'Industrial Ireland' will be found the best conspectus of the economic state and capabilities of Ireland that has recently appeared. In this small volume Mr. Dennis has supplied a contrast to the lying literature with which Ireland is drenched.

It

It is a very interesting and informing book, the *vade mecum* of the friendly visitor to Ireland; and it clearly tends to hopefulness. The next thing needed is a set of economic maps and plans, to show the state and estimated capabilities of every acre of the soil, as well as to supply the means for perfect registry of titles. The accepted dictum is that Irish land is barren and uncultivated to an extent much greater than is actually the case. There are millions of acres in the west of Ireland that might be cultivated in various ways, but are now left waste, and, were the land free, might, with judicious industry and moderate capital, return a satisfactory commercial interest on the outlay. But while the system of divided ownership continues, with diversity of interest, and with little sympathy, or none, between the landlord and the tenant, progress and improvement are impossible. A perfect agricultural survey is required; and every field, enclosure, moor, and bog should be delineated in both plan and section, and a report should be affixed describing generally what labour and material is required to bring each plot into remunerative cultivation, and pointing out what culture would be most appropriate and successful. Here would be the first step towards a practical knowledge of the country, made directly on the land, the base of Ireland's prosperity. Unless the land is thoroughly examined, and its quality and necessary treatment are well understood in practical detail, but little good can be expected, and no hope should be held out or entertained of any prompt and sound improvement.

This survey should be made immediately for a considerable part of Connaught and of Munster, where uncultivated land, and labour fit for cultivating land, are similarly plentiful. Two things indeed are wanting—will, and interest, to put labour on the land. In Connaught agriculture is contemptible, and the area of cultivation is most wastefully restricted. The male population is sufficient to farm twice the extent of land that is at present in a state of quasi-cultivation, and to do it twice as well. Where in the world besides could there be found a field of not two acres, cropped in precise equality with oats and weeds, and a cow, at mid-day, standing in the midst; the proprietor above, upon the bank, sitting, like his Majesty in Lawrence's great 'sofa' picture, and with much contentment gazing out upon creation, caring for nothing but 'to live at ease, and not be bound to think.' Such a scene is very typical of Western Ireland; and the object of all those who wish well to the nation should be to disturb and end the farmer's reverie. If beyond his farm there lies a waste of land in woeful need of cultivation, might he not be induced to undertake the reclama-

mation of some portion of this waste if he received in fee a freehold plot four times or so as large as his rack-rented farm, which he would then surrender to his landlord, with his tenant-right, in payment for his new and larger acquisition? An arrangement of this kind, with a special bargain in each case under the control of an accepted moderator, and concluding with a registered parliamentary title, transferable like money in the Funds, might set many a farmer free to make his little fortune, and would leave the landlord with his plot of land to cultivate or sell without the nuisance or obstruction of the dual tenure. Thus, by mere barter, with perhaps a very small proportion of cash down to adjust the bargain, millions of acres might be restored from barrenness to cultivation; and hundreds of thousands of young Irishmen would be released from semi-serfdom and from sheer stupidity and idleness, and be brought, like their new property, into a state of usefulness and decent culture. Reclamation once begun may be continually extended, until all the waste and cultivable lands in Ireland are, by various methods, made productive.

But for all this, knowledge is again the primal requisite; and knowledge in variety. There is no universal panacea for the multitude of different wants of Agricultural Ireland. Ideas only will not do; perception, science, nimbleness of mind, resource, and judgment, are all needed, and the farmers should be told what draining, tilling, dressing, cropping, planting and enclosing, will be suitable. There must also be superior direction in respect of the farm buildings and the dwelling-house; village arrangements should be made for roads, and outfall drains, and water reservoirs; for which some Government authority should be provided; 'And,' says Mr. Dennis, 'we must have no nonsense—as, for example, when a tenant, who would not exchange a bit of his land for a bit of some other tenant's land, put stepping-stones across the drain to give access to the piece of his holding with which he would not part, and so stopped the drainage. The boundary line was in the shape of an S; the drain intersected the S lengthways, and the tenants on either side were asked to exchange the divided pieces so that the drain might form the boundary. Rather than do that they choked the drain;' and thus gave evidence of their abundant fitness for Home Rule.

Were a company of English gentlemen to undertake the management and the allotment of a large estate on terms like these, supplying drain pipes, lime and joiners' work, and timber, it might be a lesson and example for a county or a province. By such suitable adjustment of free labour to free land, how
many

many a district in the west of Ireland might be reclaimed from desolation, and be made a very paradise! Security and quietude are all that would be needed to ensure success, for then rich immigrants would come and settle on the land. In England all our coast line is becoming peopled by comparatively wealthy settlers; and of course the value of the land is constantly increasing. Within the last thirty years some properties on the south coast have, owing to this immigration, reached twenty times their former value. But the pressure of increasing population tends to make the earlier settlers seek retirement in still more distant pleasurable scenes within some twelve hours' travelling from London. The far west of Ireland, with good railway service, is the place for people such as these. In one ten miles of valley there, are sites for certainly a hundred villas, each with its mountain side and 'water privilege,' fit for wealthy residents. With the money spent by these rich immigrants, and by the consequent trade population, what fortunes, and, with the sympathy that we invoke, what happiness, this all would bring to the enfranchised peasantry. And there are hundreds of such eligible sites throughout the charming, though forsaken, western part of Ireland.* It may be said that this is a Utopian dream; but if life and property were safe in Ireland, it would soon be a reality.

The civilizing influence of an English settlement in force would soon result in the improvement of their Irish neighbours. The most careless visitor must have remarked the miserable look of Irish cottages; and miserable cottages are found abundant even in the largest towns. In one of the main roads, within a furlong of the centre square of Galway, there are rows of cottages one story high, of four stone walls and a thatched roof, without an upper floor. On entering one of these, two steps below the level of the street, is the bare earth, without a floor of either wood, or brick, or stone. On the left hand, near the door, and looking to the street, is a small window, two feet square, that will not open, and below it something covered with a litter of old rags, serves for the children's bed. Then comes the fireplace, then the pigstye with two pigs, and then the back door opposite the entrance. To complete the circuit, are the stall or stable for the horse, all in the living room, and a small cupboard or enclosure serving as a

* Recess, and Glendalough, and Letterfrack are favourably known to those who visit Connemara; and beyond, at Renvyle, is perhaps the purest and most fragrant air in Ireland or the British Isles. Hedges of blooming fuchsia by the mile, fuchsias some 27 yards round and 7 yards high, with eschallonias, in their smaller scale, to match, are evidence of the rare qualities of soil and climate.

bed-room for the father of the family. But not a pauper family; they have their 'cattle' comfortably housed, and thus in Ireland may be numbered with the well-to-do. And yet there is no ceiling, and no plaster on the walls; and the pretence of joiners' work is fit only for a hovel. In the country districts this would be accounted a comparatively comfortable peasant's home.

Englishmen pretend to govern Ireland without knowledge. The men of Parliament, 'old hands' there, or literary craftsmen, are as ignorant as the rest about the Irish people. They know something of the screaming agitators, of obstructionists, and murderers; and when these people are particularly inconvenient the Liberal leaders, recently converted, with historical ideas and awakened consciences, look round to see if they by any means can rob somebody to appease these gentlemen, whose dynamite makes legislation possible and opportune. Such is so-called Liberal legislation. This is what the English Parliament has lately done for Ireland. The legislation is not founded on abundant and personal enquiry, and carried out with due deliberation and a careful sense of right; but is the bungling result of foolish haste, and of political and party claims, urged by command of some one in America. No more injurious failure has occurred in recent English history than the three Irish land bills. If Parliament, instead of fixing rents, had settled prices, so that the tenant might buy out the landlord, or the landlord might buy out the tenant, and by a strong Coercion Act had made it known that justice should be done on either side, with 10 per cent. as a gratuity, for the forced sale, to either vendor, there would have been abundant offers to exchange the various plots of land; and single ownership would gradually have become general, without a Plan of Campaign. But such work as this requires knowledge and determination, free from Hibernian furor, and subject to the highest English sense of equity and justice.

The House of Commons, then, is not the scene of Ireland's reformation. This must begin at home, at each man's house; and for the house the two great economic needs of Western Ireland are cheap timber and cheap lime. Vast districts of the country, once well clothed with trees, are now quite bare; and Mr. Dennis gives a chapter on the re-forestation of these parts of Ireland. Replanting would be very beneficial to the soil and climate, and would promote the health and comfort of the people. With arterial drainage it 'would raise the mean temperature of Ireland four degrees;' and bogs and mountain sides would change from barrenness to verdure. Then, the profit
would

would be worth consideration. 'Taking the country generally, it may be reasonably anticipated that an expenditure of twenty millions on the afforestation of five millions of acres in Ireland would make that vast expanse of waste land worth at least one pound per acre for thirty years; a net gain to the community of one hundred and thirty millions sterling.'

In cottage building, the deficiency and costliness of woodwork is severely felt. Two centuries ago, when English agriculturists might be supposed to have been at about the level in their house affairs of Irish peasants now, there was in England an abundance of cheap wood; and there were wooden ceilings to the lower rooms that formed the floor to attic bed-rooms, which had lath and plaster ceilings. Doors and casement windows, and the chairs and tables were well made, and cupboards and partitions were conveniently provided, all of home-grown timber. But in the west of Ireland the joinery would scandalize the poorest London artisan, and in the hovels there is scarcely any furniture. Lime is, it seems, too costly to allow of either mortar for the walls or plaster for the ceilings. Even lime-whiting is a luxury; and yet limestone is abundant.

Here, then, is further information of immensely more importance to the peasantry of Ireland than the schemes of Messrs. Patrick Ford and Gladstone, as accepted by 'the masses.' After single tenure, the great want of Ireland is abundant wood and lime; by aid of these two simple articles the first advance of Irish peasantry towards contemporary civilization must be made. The chief remedy for the unwholesome lack of lime is in a general reform of railway business throughout Ireland, and the construction of light tramways on the main high roads. The railway companies should be amalgamated under one management, with a State guarantee of the present rate of dividend. The rates and fares might then be lowered by at least a third, with increased profit. There should also be new cross lines, and extensions, more particularly in the west of Ireland; so that wood, and lime, and tiles, and drain-pipes, the first requisites of agriculture, and Indian meal, the best and cheapest food, may be obtained within an hour's carriage of each town and farm in Ireland, and that agricultural produce may have cheap and prompt conveyance to the market. And especially a new circuit railway should be made to bring all the main lines to the pier at Kingstown, so that both for passengers and goods much loss of time and cost of transfer may be saved.

Mr. Dennis tells a lamentable tale of idleness, of want of observation and resource, and of neglected opportunities; but these are not the result of the Union. The decadence began some
twenty

twenty years or more before the Union Act was passed, and was continued during Grattan's Parliament. After the Union trade revived; and during the last thirty years there has been a still further great improvement, chiefly in Belfast and in the north of Ireland. The contrast between these, and Dublin and the west of Ireland, illustrates the difference between commercial progress, due to industry and enterprise, and mere stagnation, due to careless indolence.

With Mr. Dennis as his guide, and filled with hope for Ireland, the English visitor is landed at North Wall; and passing into Sackville Street, he recognizes the huge statue of O'Connell set up by the Irish people, so conspicuously, in the centre of their capital, and the equally conspicuous idlers, who, tier upon tier, are ranged about the statue, seated on its base. Here we have a type and illustration of the long persistent dual curse of Ireland: fluent demagoguery and habitual indolence. And whatever good may be attempted for the Irish people may be tested in its practical efficiency by its influence on the duplex national disease. For though the indolence and fluency are two in form, they are in essence one; the energy of Irishmen at home has long avoided work and runs to words. The landlords are the present subject, and the victims of this volubility; the law is openly defied, the rights of property are questioned and denied, and thus, so far, the social and material improvement in the state of Ireland is prevented.

How this happens, how, by presumptuous aggression on the rights of property the poor and weak are the chief sufferers, was explained in an address on 'The Law of the Land,' delivered recently at Edinburgh, by the Hon. E. J. Phelps, the American Minister to England. Mr. Phelps first defines the difference between two sections of the law that are respectively anterior and superior to, and subsequent and subject to the legislative power. The former, 'the Law of the Land, is fundamental; the law that runs with the land and descends with the land. Not the general mass of changeable legislation or judicial decision, "perplexed in the extreme;" but that higher law under which legislation itself obtains its authority, and courts obtain their jurisdiction. The unchangeable law is that which protects the necessary and superior rights of man.' And this superior law is that which Irishmen ignore; and hence the poverty and misery in Ireland.

'No reformers have recently appeared who desire to improve society by taking the lives, even of those guilty of the offence which history shows to be the least pardonable by mankind, that of differing from the majority in opinion. But in various parts

parts of the world at the present time, in many forms, under many theories, and upon widely different propositions, the right of property has been brought into question, has given rise to violent discussion, and has become sometimes the subject of serious disturbance. In some quarters it takes the form of active opposition to all private property, and to all government. Such propositions are only appropriately met by the bullet and the rope.'

'That the labourer should somehow come to receive more than his hire, and that the unfortunate, the idle, and the prodigal, should share the prosperity they have not created, are specious propositions, eagerly listened to by those whom they promise to benefit. They afford very facile material to philosophers who are more gifted in speech than in clear understanding, and to demagogues who wish to excite the multitude rather than to instruct them.'

'It is a grave error to believe that invasion of the right of property is for the benefit of the poor. The result is precisely the reverse. Liberty is not the privilege of the strong; it is the protection of the weak. The less a man has, if he has anything, the more important it is to him that it should be safe.' 'Nothing likely to occur at this day is so much to be dreaded, and so necessary to be resisted, as movements towards the organization of parties upon the lines of personal condition, and the marshalling of one class to make war upon another.' Mr. Gladstone will perhaps take notice that 'The man who inaugurates or encourages such a warfare is a greater, because a more efficient, enemy to liberty than if he attempted to set up the worst form of despotism with which humanity was ever afflicted.' And because Mr. Gladstone has done this, his power is paralyzed. We do not speak for Lord Hartington, or for Mr. Chamberlain, or others of the foremost rank, but we believe that the immense majority of Liberal Unionists will not in any case rejoin the Liberal party while Mr. Gladstone is a candidate for place and power. And this not only on account of his new Separatist policy, but because of his unprincipled and profligate endeavour to set what he calls 'the masses' in antagonism to 'the classes,' as he denominates the voters who distrust him and his new American allies.

A word or two for the proprietors themselves. 'It is easier sometimes to disarm the demagogue by mitigating the grievances that make up his material than it is to refute him before the audiences where he has his sway. It is not always necessary or wise to push even just claims to their extremity.' And this wise counsel comes from no proprietor of Irish land, or from unsympathizing

unsympathizing England, but from a republican, the representative of the community among whom are the largest and most numerous contributors to the funds for Irish agitation. But the Irish, though they get much money from the United States, become no better off. They are the pensioners of assassins, not the pupils of a gentleman. To them the rule of law is an abomination; and with all their getting from beyond the sea they get no understanding.

With counsel such as this, however, the improvement of the Irish people must begin. There can be neither peace nor plenty until people zealously respect the law. But Mr. Gladstone may suggest that to the Irish law 'comes with a foreign aspect and wearing a foreign garb.' Quite true; and since the law is fundamentally Mosaic, every law in Christendom has something of a foreign garb. In Ireland, what is native but the whiskey and the peat? Is not the religion Roman? Is the potato an indigenous production? Does the maize crop grow in Kerry? Is Armagh entirely independent of the Pope; and have the priests themselves achieved Home Rule? If foreign rule and governance are wrong for Ireland, and injurious to Irish feeling, why is not the Church, in all its power and legislation, national exclusively? It has been said that laws 'must be brought into sympathy with public feeling,' which distinctly means that public passion is to take the place of public law. Of course there may be 'moral wrong' in Ireland 'without a legal remedy'; but where is this not frequently the case? The remark is one of those particularly silly platitudes that seem beneath the mental level of a Privy Councillor. Where is the legal remedy for the assassinations in the Phoenix Park? What remedy have the Curtins found; or almost all the victims, brute and human, of the murderous and cowardly spite of Land League agitators, and their executioners? If the public sentiment is not in harmony with the law, the sooner public sentiment is made to feel the want of harmony the better. Common observation shows that where an adequate amount of force is used to emphasize a right, the public conscience, though quite obdurate before, becomes particularly tender and appreciative. What Ireland needs is such prompt action and relentless power as will compel the evil and anarchic passions of society to quail, and shrink, and lose their impulse. What is called 'coercion' is, it seems, a very shocking and intolerable thing for Ireland. Precisely so; that is its merit. Ireland needs coercion; that is power of law; and it is the need that must succumb to the intolerance, and kindly pass away. Indeed, what are we all of us enduring but coercion? Is there one
man

man living who in all his moral sentiments anticipates the law, and is a law unto himself? In England we are not particularly righteous; probably in London there is as much moral evil and rascality in trade as in all Ireland. But in London this is all aside, apart from or within the law; and law is properly effective in its sphere. Thus trade and commerce, though abundantly polluted, become possible; and on the whole the people do advance in general prosperity. In Ireland such advance can hardly be until the people, notwithstanding what is called their moral sense, submit to both 'superior' and 'inferior' law; and patiently, like other peoples, wait until the errors in the law can be judiciously amended.

But there is another side to this dry legal question. Here in England, 'Lead us not into temptation' is our model prayer. Why should we then by foolish Land Acts, added to the similarly foolish Irish customs about land, continually tempt the Irish people? They are ignorant and impulsive; we in England are to some extent instructed, and are called phlegmatic. Might we not by various contrivances in various localities, by patient moderation, and the help of compromise, dissolve, as means may best be found, the dual tenure?—at the same time using all the forces of the State with terrible coercion on the unruly. How is our religion, that we so much vaunt above the Roman creed, to be upheld and justified, if Government does 'bear the sword in vain,' and is no 'terror to the evildoers'? The democracy of England and of Ireland should be led to understand how needful for their own continued happiness and safety is the rule of law, that they may view coercion as a blessing, not a curse. A child that handles fire gets burnt, that is coercion; but the coercion saves the infant's life, that is a blessing. And in Ireland, where the population is *in statu puerili*, suitable coercion of a quite inexorable sort is now much needed. Until this coercion is applied, and dual tenure is in process of extinction, England ought herself to be coerced, and not allowed to leave the Irish in their evil case. The first remedy is not, however, to be found in Acts of Parliament. Honourable members sit in Parliament waiting for wisdom, which they have been most particularly told that they must 'seek' for. Why not abandon the continuous war of words, and go and study Ireland before they legislate for Ireland? They then may tell the people whom they represent what they have found. And reasonable Englishmen, when they have learnt to understand the question both of moral right and law, would encourage honourable members not to be alarmed at a mere word; but to accept coercion as the backbone of the Ten Commandments that

that they every Sunday piously recite in company, with prayers that all may keep them. Thus the duty of submission would be best performed by those who most unflinchingly compel submission to the law; and government itself should be the first exemplar of this resolute compulsion, since it has immediate responsibility.

'We have strict statutes, and most biting laws,—
The needful bits and curbs to headstrong steeds,—
Which for this fourteen years we have let sleep;
Even like an o'er-grown lion in a cave;
That goes not out to prey. Now, as fond fathers,
Having bound up the threatening twigs of birch,
Only to stick it in their children's sight
For terror, not to use, in time the rod
Becomes more mock'd than fear'd; so our most just decrees,
Dead to infliction, to themselves are dead;
And liberty plucks justice by the nose;
The baby beats the nurse, and quite athwart
Goes all decorum.

It rested in your grace
T' unloose this tied-up justice.'

The outrages committed by the Nationalists in Ireland have been bad enough; but considering the secure position of the English people, the forbearance of the English Government must share the blame. The way in which the juries have been terrorized and left unprotected, the attack on Mr. Field, the treatment of the Curtin family, examples only of a terrible amount of similar neglected suffering, are a burning shame to England. Law is for the protection of the innocent; why should the innocent suffer, and their murderers and tormentors be at liberty? Law is for the coercion of the guilty; why should not the innocent coerce them, even 'with the bullet and the rope'? We keep Ireland united to us for our own convenience and safety, but we leave the orderly and suffering people subject to the savagery of the League; and Mr. Gladstone is endeavouring to obstruct such strengthening of the law as will abate this scandal; calling it, opprobriously, coercion, and proposing, in the face of overwhelming patent facts, to make enquiries. But coercion is the appropriate name by which felons and their friends and party leaders recognize protection bills, which fence these people off from injuring society. These gentlemen do not denounce the pitch-cap, boycottings, and murder. Mr. Gladstone merely wishes to remark, with cold-blooded indifference, that the invention is not new; that such things have been done in former times by some one else.

The

The recent failures of police and military to support the agents of the law have done enormous harm in Ireland. Whatever may be said about the moral right, of which in presence of the law no man is judge; whatever may have been the difficulty, and whatever might have been the cost, no man who paid his taxes to the Queen should have been left by Government without immediate help, that his judicial claim might be enforced. The outstretched hand of law in Ireland has been paralyzed, and law of course seems pitiful instead of fearful. Law presupposes ample power, or why should it exist? In Ireland we have powerless law; an imbecility.

But Parliament in anarchy can hardly give authority for law. Considering their relative position and endowments, Ireland in its most disturbed condition is less pitiable than the House of Commons. Members of the House need not, it seems, be gentlemen; and some do, intermittently at least, avail themselves of this revolting license. The old dignified and reverent tone of Parliament has ceased; and thus the House of Commons does not now impress the public mind with any sense of high distinction. Gentlemen would hardly call it as of old, 'the finest club in Europe'; nor, as a class, would they accept the title of M.P. as one of elevation. This is indeed a national disaster, and the leaders on both sides have been specially to blame for the disgrace the House endures.

Members of the House of Commons are much shocked at the agrarian disturbances in Ireland. Indeed their gaze becomes so steadfast that they hardly seem to notice what goes on within their own four walls. The public are, however, far more occupied with the frequent state of those who are supposed to represent them, than with all the knaveries of Irish peasantry. The feeling of the public has not, since the first Reform Bill, been so thoroughly aroused to indignation as it is at present in respect of the disorders in the House of Commons. Indignation is indeed a term inadequate to give expression to the sense of shame and of disgust with which the apathy of trusted members of the House, in presence of the turbulence and bad manners there, is now regarded.

Few things would give more satisfaction and delight throughout the kingdom than an order of the House that any member in the slightest matter misbehaving should, on nomination by another member, and without debate, but on the Speaker's or the Chairman's prompt decision, be directed to withdraw beyond the precincts of the House until the further pleasure of the House be known; and that no motion tending to restore the culprit should be made, or put, until the Speaker's full permission
had

had been first announced. One session of this rule would probably suffice to quench the hopes and enterprise of those who are intent on bringing the time-honoured Parliament of England down to their own low level; and who, without sufficient English resolution to the contrary, might possibly succeed. Were an election now to occur on such an issue, the success of its supporters at the polls would be unparalleled.

The Separatist Liberals have been resting on the lowest strata, those whom they have called 'the masses;' uncouth specimens of whom afflict the House of Commons. Those who have intelligence, the cultivated middle classes, are continually leaving them. The respect and confidence of the great class of quiet, thoughtful, and experienced Liberals, is irretrievably withheld from these Old Parliamentary Hands who are prepared and ready to divide the British Empire into mutually hostile territories, and into classes stirred to mutual jealousy, and hatred, and suspicion, by the cleverest tonguester and most injudicious statesman of the age.

It is disheartening, especially to those who have throughout their lives been earnest Liberals, to find so many of the Liberal party on this Home Rule question grievously beguiled by Mr. Gladstone; who again, like all vain people, is the dupe and subject of inferior men. There need, however, be no apprehension of the ultimate result of the discussion. If the Unionists are resolute and active they must be successful. They have high intelligence and right; the Separatists are mostly ignorant, and are wrong. They are, moreover, commanded and supported by a gang of murderous aliens, and exiles for their own security as well as for their country's good; and Mr. Gladstone has become the Parliamentary agent for the tail of the conspiracy. He boasts of his peculiar aged cleverness in Parliament; his versatility is also obvious. Is it quite sure that, when convenient, he may not resume his studies, read his history with more illumination, be again converted, and recant his recent dicta on Home Rule? This would be like him, and indeed may be expected. Thus his first Land Bill was to be 'a settlement;' the second Land Act, an unsettlement, was also final; and yet recently he assured the House of Commons that in honour they were bound to pass a third Land Bill; and—in dishonour, therefore—he gave up this honourable Land Bill when he found it in his way.

A project having any semblance to Home Rule, involving the existence—or the ruin—of the British Empire, should be undertaken tentatively, and should be placed, not hurriedly before Parliament, but deliberately and in detail before the
country,

country, that the popular decision might be one of judgment on full information. That some few hundred members, not particularly wise, should have the right to alter, in their ignorance, the constitution of the British Empire, because one of them is voluble, is a strange notion ; and yet that is the contention now of so-called Liberals. At one restless, vain man's bidding, they presume to urge upon the nation, to use Mr. Gladstone's own expression, 'the hasty acceptance of formulæ that they themselves do not understand.'

Mr. Gladstone's judgment often fails ; and multitudes who are not statesmen can yet form a practical opinion of that element of Mr. Gladstone's mind which is especially important in his sphere. We all can read the articles on various themes that he has published ; and those best acquainted with the subjects that he treats of testify to his peculiar want of judgment, and reject and ridicule his doctrines and conceits. Such whimsies are not wanting in his work in Parliament ; but there is a method in them. In his Reform Bill he was careful to increase the voting power in proportion to the distance from St. Stephens, since the home constituencies would have superior social influence in Parliament. This was the excuse. The reason was that Londoners were near, and well informed, and had already judged the Prime Minister and his works. The Irish were far off and ignorant, and so would hail him for his revolutionary schemes, and his unprincipled verbosity.

In character and feeling Mr. Gladstone is androgynous. With courage greater than most men, he has the emotion and impulsiveness of women ; and to this unusual combination of two qualities, together wide as humanity, his curious popularity is due. Men admire the courage, and they sympathize with the emotion. The one attracts them, and the other captivates them ; and they think his energy is earnestness, because he has a solemn manner, meant to hide his conscious want of dignified reserve. He has the failings of his qualities, and is arrogant and vain. His presumption in proposing to his colleagues and to the House of Commons, on his mere requisition to dissolve offhand the Constitution of the British nation, since he had a few months back a reverie or dream of some sort that had made him see the American and Irish conspiracy for rapine and dismemberment as something entirely opposite to what he had himself recently described them, is a specimen of his peculiar turn of mind. Such instability is the antithesis of statesmanship ; and it denotes a fatal lack of that cool, persevering patience and endurance that is so essential for a safe and prudent

prudent leader among men. Thus Mr. Gladstone has become a dangerous uncertainty and evil in the British Parliament.

To those who have some knowledge of the Irish people, the surrender of so many followers of Mr. Gladstone to the Home Rule agitators appears pitiful and cowardly. With but a modicum of insight into character, these gentlemen could hardly fail to see how weak the strongest, even, of the rebel members are. Their very noisiness and bluster should arouse suspicion; strength does not show itself in such loud-winded ways. They are true representatives, and their constituents and supporters are the noisy people who neglect their business to attend evictions, and to howl; who defraud their landlords of their rent, because their own neglected fields, crying for labour, bring forth weeds instead of corn, and refuse to cultivate with industry sufficient land to earn a decent living. These men live in squalor, and have little notion of a home in which they might first learn to rule. They are conspiring against the law, not seeing how injurious to themselves is all their clamour and conspiracy; or that capital, so careful to be under the efficient guardianship of law, avoids so turbulent a population. Probably there may be some oppression by the landlords; men are not all perfect. We in England formerly have not been wholly free from such ill conduct; but the English tenants did not foolishly defy the law. Our people hold to contracts; they respect the man that 'sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not.' In England, also, people have resource: they do not waste their time and energy in biting at a file; and if they fail in one thing, they can turn to something else, with courage and determination. But in Ireland the want of recognition of the absolute, the miserable hope that something will turn up without exertion, that in the lottery of fraud they may be fortunate, results in constant beggary; the people will not diligently work. The Irish either can live on their petty plots of land by proper cultivation, or, if not, they should abandon them, and sell their tenant-right, and seek employment somewhere else. Success attends migration, which is not a grievous thing, but a great good for men; and fixity of tenure (not simplicity of tenure), that the Irish cry for, is, in fact, their curse. To stay for generations in one region is unsalutary; and where this occurs the people mostly are half-civilized, behind the world, and even physically imbecile. Thus Ireland wants new blood, new men, new energy, and new ideas. It is at the end of Europe, off the line of traffic of the world; and mental, physical, and moral change must be, by novel scenes and opportunities, afforded to
its

its very stagnant population. With an English immigration, therefore, there should be an Irish emigration; and the Father of the Faithful is a pattern and example for the too-adhesive Irish agriculturist. The Irish struggle for the land is silly and dishonest, and makes Englishmen avoid the country as a place of residence or of investment. We want Ireland to be rich. For England a rich neighbour would be better than a poor one. But riches will take time, and work, and patience, to accumulate. The agitators tell the Irish to seize quickly other people's wealth; the dupes not having learnt that those who make haste to be rich, instead of working patiently, will surely come to want. The Plan may be a gain of some few thousands to the people, but it will entail the loss of hundreds of millions in capital and credit, and generations of possible advancement.

Fixity of tenure, with a sliding, produce rent, has been proposed for Ireland; this would, however, be inadequate for the increase of population and for their employment. There must be diligent extended cultivation of waste land, with very great improvement in the character of farming; there must be security and quietude, that capital may flow throughout the land; and there must also be abundant railways, tramways, and cross roads, to open up the country. While this is all in progress there must be a profitable system of migration, possibly some emigration; and if these things are all carried out with a firm hand—for Ireland is demoralized far more by English hesitation than by Irish agitation—Ireland will soon become industrious, and populous and wealthy. There is evidently hope for Ireland. Irish party fights and faction fights, as some of us have known them, are now mostly things of history; and their present petty tribalism—which they do *not* fight for—will, when the people have prosperity, and are relieved from apprehension, be forgotten. We, in England, have our own provincial vanities; Kent is *Invicta*, and the counties used, with friendly haughtiness, to look down on 'the shires.' And so a Munster man may still rejoice and glory in his province, and to him Ireland will always remain 'the first gem of the sea.' But the enthusiastic Irishman will in due time perceive and feel that as a British citizen and subject he is something higher in the world than as a mere provincial, and that his country by the Union with England has been raised in dignity, wealth and power.

Of course there will, ere this, be times of trouble and perplexity; but with Ireland and England thoroughly united, each with separate individuality of character, but with sympathy in
work

work and aim, these troubles will result in greater strength and higher wisdom. To attain this excellence of strength and wisdom manly firmness is required; feminine emotion, instability, and haste, are out of place. Impulse must give way to resolution, sensibility to understanding, foolish legislation to firm government. Ireland will be conciliated when she sees that reconciliation is her only hope. O'Connell recognized this single expectation for the good of Ireland; and when his agitator's work was over, he, in his last speech, appealed to Englishmen to justify this one remaining hope. 'Ireland is in your hands, in your power; if you do not save her, she cannot save herself.' And though the times, and urgent accidents, have changed, the fact itself remains; and England has with fortitude and faithfulness to accept and to administer O'Connell's legacy.

The first duty of the Government at the present time is, clearly, to protect the Irish from conspirators and rogues. We are not indifferent to remedial measures, and have in the course of this article suggested several that might be adopted with advantage. But Life, Liberty, and Property, are rights 'anterior and superior to' any question of dual tenure or the amelioration of the people. Mr. Gladstone, when he was Prime Minister, said that the 'obligation incumbent upon the Government was to protect every citizen in the enjoyment of his life and property.' In some parts of Ireland life is now unsafe, the very name of liberty is scandalized, and people have no happiness in view, but only apprehension and despair. This must be ended; and the Government must be upheld and strengthened in their undertaking to protect the innocent in Ireland. The tens of thousands, principally fools, with a fermenting leaven of accomplished knaves, who lately made a Babel of Hyde Park, have done their worst. The public, those who have responsibility and character, are glad to let these people shout amain, and hear the echo of their own delightful voices. But such demonstrations have no influence on the will and policy of England, as they represent no wholesome element or function of the British Constitution.

The country has been reasonably angered by the want of government in Ireland. A very large proportion of the people who support Home Rule are doing so because they despair of seeing the Law of the Land made paramount in Ireland. This is the most important factor in the present urgency of our political affairs. The country does insist on the protection of life and property: on that it is determined, and who ever fails to do so will

will be rejected from the Government with wholesome promptitude. The friends of Mr. Gladstone are, especially in Ireland and in the House of Commons, the excitors of disorder; and if Unionists do not put it down, then the nation will despair. The Government must press forward the Crimes Bill with promptitude and vigour, and must not hesitate to put the Closure in force, if necessary, after the measure has received full and adequate discussion. Mr. Gladstone complained of the extraordinary pressure that was exerted in order to pass the first reading of this Bill; but Lord Lymington, in a very timely letter,* has pointed out that Mr. Gladstone himself exerted still greater pressure to carry his own Coercion Bill. What then took place is so important in reference to the present measure that we quote Lord Lymington's words:—

'The reluctance of Sir Robert Peel to press his measures of coercion, for which he is now extolled by Mr. Gladstone, the present leader of the Parnellite Liberals, was never displayed by Mr. Gladstone in 1881 as Leader of the House and of the Liberal party. At 9 A.M. on Wednesday, February 2, after an unbroken sitting of forty-one and a half hours, Mr. Brand declined to call upon any more members to speak, and at once put the question from the Chair. This arbitrary act on the part of the Speaker was not only heartily supported by Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party, but it was necessitated by the refusal of the Liberal Government to allow the discussion on the preliminary stage of Mr. Forster's Coercion Bill to be prolonged for more than four nights. That Bill was introduced by Mr. Forster on January 24th, discussed on the 27th and 28th, and because on the 31st the vast majority of the Irish representatives would not consent to the first reading, Mr. Gladstone was responsible for the most extraordinary pressure that has ever been applied by a Speaker and a majority of the House to the representatives of Ireland.'

The Attorney-General for Ireland stated, with perfect truth, in the House of Commons, 'that there was no reason why the present Bill might not be extended or made law in any portion of Her Majesty's dominions, without interfering in the slightest degree with constitutional rights, or without infringing in any way public liberty.' If there had been time this Session, we should have liked to have seen most of the provisions in the Bill incorporated in a general measure for the reform of the criminal law applicable to the whole of the United Kingdom. Two years ago we advocated this view, and pointed out that, if only change of venue, trial of important offences by special juries, an extension of summary jurisdiction, and the power of enquiring into offences for which no prisoner is in custody,

* See the 'Times,' April 8, 1887.

were retained in the Crimes Act, then nearly expiring, a most useful addition would be made to the reasonable power which in all well-ordered communities the Executive should have for the prevention and punishment of crime.* We are glad to find that Professor Dicey is of the same opinion.

'A Coercion Act should as far as possible be neither a temporary nor an exceptional piece of legislation. An Act which increases the efficiency of the criminal law should, like other statutes, be a permanent enactment. The temporary character of Coercion Acts has needlessly increased their severity, for Members of Parliament have justified to themselves carelessness in fixing the limits of powers conferred upon the Executive under the insufficient plea that these powers were intended to last but for a short time. It has also deprived them of moral weight. An Act which is a law in 1881, but will cease to be a law in 1882, has neither the impressiveness nor the certainty which gives dignity to the ordinary law of the land. Coercion Acts, again, should be general—that is, should apply, not to one part, but to the whole, of the United Kingdom. Powers needed by the Government for constant use in Ireland must occasionally be wanted in England, or, if they do not exist there already, in Scotland. It were the strangest anomaly for the law to sanction a mode of procedure which convicts a dynamiter in Dublin, and not to give the Government the same means for the conviction of the same criminal for the same offence if he has crossed to Liverpool.

'An Act which should be permanent, which should apply to the whole United Kingdom, which should deal, not indeed exclusively but in the main, with criminal procedure, could hardly contain injudicious, harsh or tyrannical provisions. To enlarge the power of examining persons suspected of connection with a crime, even though no man is put upon his trial; to get rid of every difficulty in changing the venue; to give the Courts the right under certain circumstances of trying criminals without the intervention of a jury; to organize much more thoroughly than it is organized at present in England the whole system of criminal prosecutions; to enable the Executive to prohibit public meetings which might provoke a breach of the peace, would in many cases be an improvement on the criminal law of England itself, and would in several instances be simply an extension to the whole United Kingdom of laws which exist without exciting any disapproval in some one division of it.'

The Bill has been denounced by Mr. Gladstone as the 'worst, most insulting, and most causeless Coercion Bill ever submitted to Parliament.' If by 'worst' he means most severe, this is a gross misstatement. His own Coercion Act of 1881 was far severer, and, in many of its enactments, even tyrannical. As Lord Grey has pointed out,† it did not simply suspend the

* See 'Quarterly Review,' April, 1885, pp. 494, 495.

† See the 'Times,' April 14, 1887.

Habeas Corpus Act, but it gave to the Lord Lieutenant the power of issuing a warrant against any person 'reasonably suspected of having been guilty as principal or accessory' of certain offences. Thus, adds Lord Grey:—

'The Lord Lieutenant was invested with the power of inflicting the punishment of imprisonment on any man he thought fit, not for crimes of which he could be proved to be guilty, but for being "reasonably suspected." Thus while former Acts had for their object the prevention of offences, as is stated in the preambles of some of them, the Act of 1881 distinctly provided for men being kept in prison, not to guard against danger from what they might do if at large, but on account of what they might be suspected to have done already—that is to say, the measure was penal, not precautionary.'

In consequence of this power more than a thousand persons, including Mr. Parnell and other Members of Parliament, were shut up in prison for several months without being brought to trial for any offence. Even Mr. Gladstone's second Coercion Act, passed in the following year, gave the Executive more extensive powers than are conferred by the Bill of the present Government. It is true, that that Act was passed for only a limited time; but this was its chief defect, and gave rise to the political complications of 1885, from the results of which we are now suffering. A chief merit of the present Bill is in its resolute continuance. This all can understand, and all wise people will approve. But very few can comprehend the legal niceties of its details; and on the ample power of these details to crush the spirit of disorder depends the existence of the Government and of the Union. The Bill should therefore be examined with the utmost care, to make it overwhelmingly sufficient. Mr. Gladstone's wild expletives in denunciation of the Bill appear to show that this sufficiency has been provided for: in his excessive irritation there is ground for public hope; and this hope must not be disappointed.

[The text on this page is extremely faint and illegible. It appears to be a multi-paragraph document, possibly a letter or a report, with several lines of text visible across the page. The content cannot be transcribed due to the poor quality of the scan.]

INDEX

TO THE

HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH VOLUME OF THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

A.

- Alexandria, its foundation, 92—literary and scientific school, 96.
 Anderson, Mr. W., on the history of Japanese art, 97—early art in China, 101—Hokusai's peculiar genius, 106—descriptive catalogue, 112.
 Anglo-Indian Glossary, Colonel Yule's, 144—his testimony to Mr. Burrell's co-operation, 145—cheese, dam, 147—the title 'Hobson-Jobson,' 148—Juggernaut, 149—Running a Muck, 150—chop, 151—Arrack, Ananas, 152—Mango, Ayah, Chicane, 153—Compound, 154—Bungalow, 155—Prickly-heat, beriberi, 156—Mort de Chien, cholera, 157—Bahaudur, Dewaun, 158—Turban, 160—Kincob, demijohn, 161—Moor, Moorman, 162—Seychelle Islands, 163—165—Bombay Marine, 165.
 Argentine Republic, scarcity of wheat, 474. *See* Wheat growing.
 Argyll, Duke of, and the Bill to abolish Church patronage in Scotland, 175—the social position of the Scotch clergy, 176.
 Arnold, Dr., his share in the first Councils of the University of London, 40—on the 'Penny Magazine,' and religious examination, 41.
 Atlantic accelerated service to Canada, 139, 140.
 Audsley, Mr. G. A., 'The Ornamental Arts of Japan,' 97.
 Australasian Colonies, wheat area in, 467—469. *See* Wheat growing.
 Austria-Hungary, imports from, 466.

B.

- Bacon's dream of Solomon's House in the 'New Atlantis,' 35.
 Benjamin, Mr., 'Persia and the Persians,' 221—on attacking the Trans-Caspian communications, 230.
 Bramhall, Bishop, controversy with Hobbes, 429—431.

Vol. 164.—No. 328.

- Bright, Mr., on the value of the classics in modern education, 243.
 Buisson, M., on the certificate of studentship, 46.
 Byron and Shelley compared, 486.

C.

- Caird, Sir J., on depression of trade and agriculture, 449.
 Campbell, T., his plan for the London University, 38.
 Canada, decline in exports of wheat and flour, 470—acreage and produce, 471—mean yield in Ontario and Manitoba, *ib.* *See* Wheat growing.
 Canadian Pacific Railway, 119—Major C. Smith its first advocate, 120—the Act of Union, 121—Resolution of the Dominion Parliament, 122—Mr. Mackenzie's proposals, 123—policy of the new Cabinet, *ib.*—Sir C. Tupper's Resolutions, 124—receives the Royal assent, 125—conditions of the contract, *ib.*—arrangement with the Ontario and Quebec Railway, 126—record of construction, 127—length of mileage *per diem*, 129—dynamite factories, 130—the Kicking Horse Pass, 131—descent of the Selkirks, 132—the last spike driven by Sir D. Smith, *ib.*—Queen Victoria's message of congratulation, 133—first through train service, *ib.*—advantage of being under one management, 134—Montreal in daily communication with the Pacific Coast, *ib.*—Steel Bridge at Lachine, 135—number of men employed, *ib.*—rules and regulations, *ib.*—outlay, 136—financial success, 137—advantages to emigrants, 138—mining industry, 139—ocean service, *ib.*—an alternative route to India, 140—food supplies, 141.
 Chamberlain, Mr., his service to the Union, 273.
 Chili, average yield of wheat, 474.
 Church Patronage, 167—details and

2 R

- qualifications of the Bill, 167-170—
diocesan councils, 170, 171—objec-
tions to a presentee, 172—general un-
advisability, 173—National Church
Reform Union, 174—Scotch Church
patronage, 174, 175—private patron-
age, 176—the bishop's power to reject
unfit presentees, 177—the veto, 178—
discretionary power, 179—law-suits
and appeals, 180—sale of livings, 181,
184—value of private patrons, 182—
sale of advowsons, 184—augmented
livings, 186—Mr. E. Stark's evidence,
187—simony, 188—resignation
bonds, 189—decline in the net value
of livings, 190—Lord Devon's opi-
nion, 191—the Public Worship Bill,
192—Dilapidation Act and Clerical
Pensions Act, *ib.*
- Churchill, Lord R., his resignation
270—sagacity and industry, 271.
- Connell, Mr. A. R., 'Indian Railways
and Indian Wheat,' 463.
- Constantinople, Russia, and India, 218
—new phases in the Eastern ques-
tion, 219—proximity of the Russian
outposts to the Indian frontier, 220
—effect in St. Petersburg of Veresh-
chagin's picture, 221—Mr. Benjamin
on the conduct of Russia, *ib.*—Lieut.
Yate on her encroachments, 222—want
of new markets for her trade, 223—
permanent and lucrative posts, 224
—influence of public opinion, 225—
value to England of the position of
Constantinople, 226—the Suez Canal
route, 227—best line of attack in
the Black Sea, 228—Persia an un-
willing ally, 229—importance of
attacking the Russian Trans-Caspian
communications, *ib.*—moral effect of
success on Asiatics, 231—numerical
superiority of the Russian over the
English army, 232—food supply, 234
—the resources of Russia in the last
Russo-Turkish war, 235—condition
of the peasantry, 236, 237—Nihilist
propaganda, 237—internal enemies,
238—financial condition, 239.
- Cowley's proposition for the advance-
ment of experimental philosophy,
36.
- Creighton, Dr., translation of Dr.
Hirsch's Handbook of Geographical
and Historical Pathology, 196.
- D.
- Daphne (Tahpanhes), sites of Greek
camps discovered, 72—the house of
the Jew's daughter, 75.
- Dennis, Mr., 'Industrial Ireland,' 556.
- Devon, Lord, his views on Church
Patronage, 191.
- Dicey, Prof., England's Case against
'Home Rule,' 553.
- Dictionary of National Biography
edited by Leslie Stephen, 350—
object of a biographical dictionary,
352—the 'Biographia Britannica,'
353—Bale's 'Catalogus Scriptorum,'
354—omissions, 355—Pits' 'Rela-
tiones Historice,' 356—Anthony à
Wood's 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' *ib.*—
the 'Life of Byron,' 357—A. Bacon,
358—Anselm, Lord Brougham, 359
—Falkes de Breaute, 360—theatrical
biographies, *ib.*—naval, 361—Roman
Catholic writers, confessors and
priests, *ib.*—Anderton, 362—Barring-
ton, the pickpocket, 363—epigram
on him and the Bishop of Salisbury,
363, *n.*—various articles and contribu-
tors, 364—Mr. J. C. Higgin, 365—
Abadie, 366—Blondel, Casaubon,
R. Balfour, 367—T. Barclay, M. A.
Boyd, G. Buchanan, J. Cameron, 368
—R. Caron, A. Hales, 369—Arch-
bishop Bradwardine, J. Baconthorpe,
Burley, 370—sons and daughters of
sovereigns, 372—English Judges,
ib.—Scottish Judges, 373—Bishops,
ib.—the importance of accuracy in
dates of births and deaths, 374—
lives and writings of authors, *ib.*—
biographical and bibliographical no-
tices, 375—repetitions and contra-
dictions, 376—notice of H. N. Bell,
377—inaccuracy in genealogy and
heraldry, 378—mass of valuable
matter, 379.
- Disraeli, Mr., Lord Shaftesbury's re-
marks on his becoming Premier, 28
—Peel's neglect of him, 515.
- Dodge, Mr., on the wheat production
in the United States, 452—mixed
husbandry, 460.
- Dowden, Prof., 'Life of Percy Bysshe
Shelley,' 285.
- E.
- Edinburgh, Duke of, paper on the
causes of the loss of life in the North
Sea fishermen, 386.
- Epidemics, 193—Simpson's Antiqua-
rian Notes on Leprosy, 194—Hirsch's
Geographical and Historical Patho-
logy, *ib.*—Dr. Creighton's transla-
tion, 196—Sydenham's 'Observa-
tiones Medice,' 197—geographical
distribution of different types, *ib.*

—rise and extinction of new types, 198—the English sweating sickness, second and third outbreak, 199—last appearance, 200—the 'Snette des Picards,' 201–204—Asiatic cholera first in Europe, 205—Dr. J. Murray on the Malwa sweating sickness, *ib.*—number of deaths at the Hurdwar festival of 1783, 206—endemic area of cholera, *ib.*—at Toulon in 1884, 207—in India, 208—pollutions of soil, 209—yellow fever, 210—madrepore hypothesis, 211—Audouard's theory, 212—the pellagra of Lombardy, *ib.*—maize diet, 213—leprosy, 214—the beriberi, plague, typhus fever, diphtheria, and garrotillo, *ib.*—malarial or climatic fever, 215—goitre and cretinism, *ib.*—the Peruvian wart, 216—cholera-germ, *ib.*

F.

Framlingham Castle, Queen Mary's standard raised, 393. *See* Suffolk.
France Protestantie, la, new edition by M. H. Bordier, 367. *See* Dictionary.

G.

Gardner, Mr., Greek inscriptions found by him at Naucratis, 74.
Germany, exports of wheat and flour, 466. *See* Wheat growing.
Gladstone, Mr., his character described by Lord Shaftesbury, 28—delusions about a Home Rule Bill, 281—a champion of Ultra-Toryism in 1841, 515—attack on the Budget, 534—relations with Sir G. Lewis, 539—at Leeds, on the Irish party in America urging assassination, 549—adulation of his followers, 550.
Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft, her connection with Shelley, 299.
Goschen, Mr., appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer, 272.
Gresham College founded, 34.
Greville's Memoirs, 509. *See* History.

H.

Hartington, Lord, his motives for declining to join the Ministry, 272.
Hirsch, Dr. A., his Geographical and Historical Pathology, 193.
History, English, from Peel to Palmerston, 507—the modern Whig party of the last generation, 510—decline of the Whig power under Lord Melbourne, 511—Sir E. Peel's competition for the conduct of the administration, 512—growth of opinion in

his favour, 512—the champion of Protection, 513—Greville's summary of his public life, *ib.*—Mr. Walpole's character of him, 514—Sir J. Graham's unsympathetic character, *ib.*—Peel's neglect of Disraeli, 515—Gladstone a champion of Ultra-Toryism, *ib.*—Corn Law proposals, 516—Potato famine, 517—Lord J. Russell relinquishes the task of forming a cabinet, *ib.*—Peel Secretary for the Colonies, 518—his Irish policy, 519, 525—Sir C. Wood's development of Peel's fiscal policy, 520—increase of the Maynooth Grant, 521—expedients to relieve Irish distress in 1847 and 1848, 523—Bright's censure on the incapacity of the Government, 526—the Session of 1851, 527—Papal aggression, 528—restriction on Papal power, 529—Disraeli's annual motion on agricultural distress, 530—Mr. Locke King's resolution on the franchise, *ib.*—quarrel between Russell and Palmerston, 531—Lord Palmerston's conduct of foreign affairs, 532—Lord Derby Prime Minister, 533—Gladstone's attack on the Budget, 534—Lord Aberdeen's peace policy, 535—fall of the Ministry on Roebuck's motion, 536—Lord Palmerston's administration, 537—his ability and popularity, 538—relations between Gladstone and Sir G. Lewis, 539—Villiers on Gladstone's talents and oratorical powers, 540.

Hobbes of Malmesbury, 415—his old works published under new titles and combinations, 415, 416—an acute logician, 416—birth and education, 417—travels as tutor to Lord Cavendish, *ib.*—studies Physics in Paris, *ib.*—his tract on the 'Elements of Law, Natural and Politique,' 418—mathematical tutor to the Prince of Wales, 418, 442—effect of the 'Leviathan,' 419—his pension, *ib.*—translates Homer, 'Behemoth,' 'Common Laws of England,' 420—'Decameron Physiologician,' 421—illness and death, *ib.*—civil policy, *ib.*—despotism, 422—origin of civil society, 423—contract of the Convention Parliament of William, 423, 424—difference between him and Rousseau, 425—sympathy with the philosophical Radicals, *ib.*—state control of the Church, 426—his reputation of Atheism, 427—freedom of the will and the doctrine of Election, 428—controversy with Bp. Bramhall, 429,

432—fatalism clothed with a Christian dress, 433—follies and contradictions, 434—laws of Nature and Divine law, 435—imaginary terrors, 436—physical enquiries and universal propositions, 437—439—blunders in mathematics, 439—441—metaphysics, 441—the 'Leviathan' suppressed, 443—closing years, *ib.*—hybrid philosophy, 444.

Hobson-Jobson, 144. *See* Anglo-Indian.

Hodder, Mr. E., 'Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury,' 1.

I.

India, supply of wheat from, 461—cost of produce, 462—depreciation of the rupee, 463. *See* Wheat growing.

J.

Japan, Pictorial Arts of, 97—Chinese in their origin, 98—earliest use of Chinese written characters, *ib.*—early efforts, 99—early art in China, 100, 101—its degeneracy, 101—Buddhist portraits, 102—Tosa artists, *ib.*—Toba-yé or Toba caricatures, 103—free-handed monochromes, *ib.*—Chinese influence, 104—the popular school inaugurated by Moronobu, 105—lacquer designers, *ib.*—Hokusai, 106—Shijo Naturalists, 107—pictorial engraving, *ib.*—freedom of hand, 108—effects of the use of European pigments, 109—tendency to symbolism, 110—conventionalities, 111—Mr. Anderson's Catalogue, 112, 113—'Twenty-four Paragons of Filial Piety,' 114—legend, history and folk-lore, 115—story of the selfish son, 116—typical example of Chinese scenery, *ib.*—the future of Japanese Art, 118.

Jeremiah, the Prophet, his prophecy at Tahpanhes, 74. *See* Naucratis.

K.

King's College founded, 39.

L.

Law, William, author of the 'Serious Call,' 344. *See* Nonjurors.

Lawrence, Mr., on the position of England with regard to the Egyptian question, 142. *See* Canadian Pacific.

Leslie, Rev. B. J., 'The Life and Writings of Charles Leslie, Non-juring Divine,' 322, 337.

Literature, a School of English, 241—contemplated at Oxford, 242—Mr. Bright on the study of the Classics, 243—Prof. Müller on the scope and functions of a Chair of Literature, 244—questions for the Hebdomadal Council, 245—various opinions, 246—their uniformity, 247—Prof. Huxley, *ib.*—Archbp. of Canterbury, 247, 251—the Card. Archbp. of Westminster, 247—Sir T. Martin, 248—Prof. Jowett, 248, 249—Canon Farrar and the Head Masters of Rugby and Clifton, 248—Prof. A. Goodwin, Mr. Ad. Symonds, 249—Rector of Lincoln, *ib.*—Mr. Pater, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Carnarvon, 250—Bp. of London, Mr. M. Arnold, 251—Prof. Bonamy Price, Mr. Froude, Mr. J. Morley, 252—Lord Lytton, 254—257—modification of the present classic curriculum, 257—aim of Moderations and of the Final School of Literæ Humaniores, 258—subjects to be included, 260—263—danger of the cultivation of philology, 264—266—an Honour School, and a Pass School, 268.

Lubbock, Sir J., representative in the House of Commons of the University of London, 51.

Lyell, Sir C., on the crag deposits in Suffolk, 385.

Lymington, Lord, his letter to the 'Times,' 573.

Lytton, Lord, on the study of English Literature, 254—257.

M.

Moberley, Mr., discovery of the Eagle Pass, 132. *See* Canadian Pacific.

Morley, Mr. J., on the study of English Literature, 252—the 'Plan of Campaign,' 551.

Müller, Prof. M., the scope and functions of a Chair of Literature, 244.

Murillo's picture of 'The Healing of the Man at the Pool of Bethesda' at Orwell, 411.

N.

National Church Reform Union, the, 174. *See* Church Patronage.

National League and Law of the Land, 541—Mr. Dillon at Ballyhaunis, *ib.*—at Castlerena, 545—rights of landlord and tenant, 542—Lord Lansdowne's tenants, 543—the R. C. Archbp. of Dublin on reduction in rents, 544—rents paid to the agents of

the League, 545—injury to the whole condition of the country, 546—Mr. Justice O'Brien's charge to the grand jury at Ennis, *ib.*—land questions a permanent disease in Ireland, 547—deceit and mendicancy of the well-to-do, *ib.*—tacit and open sanction of the Irish Campaign, 548—fixed dual tenure, *ib.*—Mr. Gladstone, at Leeds, 549, 550—Mr. Morley and the 'Plan of Campaign,' 551—the Separatist party, 552—necessity for national enlightenment, *ib.*—monomania of the Irish on political affairs, 553—Prof. Dicey on Home Rule, 553—555—an English mission to help the antagonistic Irish classes, 555, 556—Mr. Dennis's 'Industrial Ireland,' 556—agriculture in Connaught, 557—reclamation of waste land, 558—soil and climate in the Western part of Ireland, 559—miserable cottages, *ib.*—replanting and arterial drainage, 560—want of wood and lime, 561—idleness and neglected opportunities, *ib.*—demagogy and habitual indolence, 562—Mr. Phelps's 'Law of the Land,' 562, 563—need of coercion, 564—566—failure of the police and military to support the law, 567—disorders in the House of Commons, *ib.*—Mr. Gladstone and his various Land Bills, 568, 569—need of new blood in Ireland, 570—migration and emigration, 571—O'Connell's legacy to England, 572—protection of life and property, *ib.*—the Crimes Bill, 573—Lord Lymington's letter to the 'Times,' *ib.*—Prof. Dicey on the Coercion Act, 574—Lord Grey on the power of the Lord Lieutenant, 575.

Naucratis and the Greeks in Ancient Egypt, 66—paintings in the temple of Medinet Habu, *ib.*—the tales of Herodotus, 68—accession of Psammitichus, 69—Greek travellers in Egypt, *ib.*—Egyptian Art studied by Phœnicians, 71—Sais made the capital, *ib.*—discovery of the Greek camps at Daphnæ, 72—invasion of Scythians, *ib.*—Necho, 73—a canal attempted from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea, *ib.*—Psammitichus II., 74—Apries, *ib.*—'the house of the Jew's daughter' at Daphnæ, 75—Amasis, *ib.*—his wisdom and wealth, 76—Persian conquest under Psammitichus III., 77—position of Naucratis, *ib.*—Scarabs, manufacture of, 79—early Greek temples, *ib.*—'rubbish heaps,' 80—the Hellenion founded, 81

—its discovery, 82—history, 83—various travellers, 85—products of Greek art, 86—Persian dominion in Egypt, *ib.*—Cambyses' mad deeds, 87—Darius Hystaspes, *ib.*—revolt under Inaros, 88—his death, and defeat of the Greeks, 89—Amyrtaeus, *ib.*—Achoris, Nectanebus, and Tachos, 90—Persian invasion under Ochus, 91—Alexander the Great builds Alexandria, 92—decline of Naucratis, 93—Ptolemaic kings, *ib.*—Egyptian deities, *ib.*—Boards of Judges, 94—political constitution, 95—influx of Greek architects, artists, and artisans, *ib.*—progress under Ptolemy Philadelphus, 96—literary and scientific school at Alexandria, *ib.*

Nelson, Robert, his 'Companion for the Festivals and Fasts,' 333.

New Zealand, decrease in the acreage of the wheat crop, 469.

Newman, Card., on the project of a Catholic University in Dublin, 43.

Niclaes, Henri, founder of the Society of the Family of Love, 481—his visionary theories, 482.

Nonjurors, the, 322—causes for the schism of Primate Sancroft, and others, 323—Hickes and Wagstaffe raised to the episcopate, 324—Bp. Frampton declines to set up a separate sect, 325—Bp. Ken retires into privacy, 326—withdraws in favour of Hooper, 327—Stillington on the separation of the nonjuring prelates. 328—their inconsistencies, 329—death of Sancroft, 330—the 'Usagers,' 331—close of the secession, 332—R. Nelson, *ib.*—his friendship for Kettlewell, 333—H. Dodwell, *ib.*—returns to the National Church, 334—his marriage, 335—Epistolary Discourse, 336—Dean Hickes, 336, 337—C. Leslie, 337—a politician rather than a theologian, 338—the 'Rehearsal,' 339—Sherlock the Elder, *ib.*—his recantation, lampoons, 340—Sherlock the Younger, 341—J. Collier, *ib.*—on the Profaneness and Immorality of the English stage, 342—'Ecclesiastical History,' *ib.*—Spinckes, his popular books, 343—the Usagers seek an alliance with the Greek Church, *ib.*—W. Law, 344, 345—his 'Serious Call,' 346—his home at King's Cliffe, 347—Gibbon's description of him, 348.

O.

Overton, Rev. J. H., 'William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic,' 322.

P.

- Palmerston, Lord, admiration and affection of Lord Shaftesbury for, 26.
- Peel, Sir R., his character summed up by Lord Shaftesbury, 27.
- Petition addressed to the Hebdomadal Council for the foundation of a School of Modern Literature, 241.
- Petrie, Mr. W. M. Flinders, excavations at Naucratis, 66, 77.
- Plantin, Christopher, the Antwerp Printer, 475—birth and early years, 476—at Antwerp, *ib.*—his accident and illness, 477—adopts printing, *ib.*—difficulties besetting publishers and booksellers, *ib.*—question of copyright, 478—hindrances and losses, *ib.*—perils and penalties, 479—the Margrave's domiciliary visit, 480—a member of an Anabaptist sect, 481—its attractions, 482—reasons for joining, 483—accused of diverting some jewels to his own use, *ib.*—letters between him and Postel, 484—sale of all his property, returns as managing partner, *ib.*—excesses of the reformed party, 485—undertakes the Polyglot Bible, 486—cost of publication, 486, 487—B. A. Montanus chosen editor, 488—hard conditions, 489—enormous outlay, 490—completion of the work, 491—the Royal edition sent to Alva now in British Museum, 492—the Pope's 'approbation and privilege' refused, 493—office of royal 'protopographus' created and bestowed on him, *ib.*—extract from Notarial Act, 494—the 'Index Prohibitorius and Expurgatorius,' 495—its secret carefully kept, 496—revision of the Breviary and the Missal of Spain, 497—Philip II.'s instructions and corrections, 498—liturgical works, *ib.*—elaborate folios in every branch of literature, 499—letter to Arias on the outrages of the Spanish soldier, *ib.*—liabilities and debts, 500—dexterous tactics, 501—his 'grief' against the Spanish King, *ib.*—noble qualities and unwearied labours, 502—presents to powerful people, 503—complaints of the workmen from his son-in-law, *ib.*—cost of the Frankfort journey, 504—his domestic life, *ib.*—particulars of his daughter Marguerite's wedding, 505—letter to his daughter Catharine, 506.
- Potato famine in 1845, 517.

R.

- Randich, Mr. J., on cereal production in Russia, 464—low rate of exchange for silver, 465.
- Read and Pell, Messrs., visit to the United States, 456, 458.
- Richmond, Duke of, his Government Bill to abolish Church patronage in Scotland, 175.
- Robertson, Prof. G. C., 'Hobbes,' 415.
- Rogers, Major, 132. *See* Canadian Pacific.
- Roose, M., describes Nicolaes' 'Mirror of Righteousness,' 482—Plantin's connection with it, 483.
- Rossetti, Mr., the authenticity of Hogg's letters, 292. *See* Shelley.
- Roth, Mr. H. L., 'Sketch of the Agriculture and Peasantry of Eastern Russia,' 465.
- Rubbish-heaps at Naucratis, 81.
- Russell, Earl, hard judgment of him by Lord Shaftesbury, 27.
- Russia, 219. *See* Constantinople. Condition of the agricultural classes, 464—produce of wheat per acre, 465.

S.

- Sadler, Mr., his 'Ten Hours Bill,' 12.
- Selborne, Lord, his 'Defence of the Church against Disestablishment,' 170—number of parish churches and curates in England, 180, *n.*
- Seychelle Islands, origin of name, 163.
- Session, the Coming, 270—Lord R. Churchill's resignation, *ib.*—Lord Salisbury's difficult position, 271—Mr. Goschen's appointment, 272—Mr. Chamberlain's service to the Union, 273—failure of Mr. Gladstone's Irish Policy, 274—Mr. Dillon's response to Mr. Morley's hints, *ib.*—the duty of the Conservative party to Ireland, 275—Sir M. Hicks-Beach's harassing duties, 276—obstructions in the House of Commons, 277—time wasted on the debate on the Address, *ib.*—the Closure, 278—Lord Ripon's summing up of the Irish question, 279—specious arguments of the Separatists, 280—Mr. Gladstone's delusions, 281—our relations with Foreign Powers, 282—necessity of a strong navy, 283—administration of the public funds, *ib.*
- Shaftesbury, Lord, his Life and Work, 1—religious views, 2—intellectual simplicity, 4—on the Bishopric of Jerusalem, 6—tender sympathy, 7—at Harrow and Oxford, 8—in Parlia-

- ment, *ib.*—self-mistrust, 9—lowness of his finances, 10—marriage, 11—the 'Ten Hours Bill,' 13—in the Royal household, 14—his 'escape' from a seat in the Cabinet, 15—efforts for the infant chimney-sweepers, and employment of women and children in mines, 16—in calico print-works, 17—feelings on the passing of the Factory Bill, 18—accession to the peerage, 19—philanthropic labours, 20—Earl of Mornington's challenge, *ib.*—chairman of the Board of Health, 21—money pressure, 22—Ragged School work, 23—Barrow and Donkey Club, 25—affection and admiration for Lord Palmerston, 26—judgment of Sir R. Peel and Earl Russell, 27—of Gladstone and Disraeli, 28—of Louis XIV., 29—his own party in the Church, 30—rupture with the S. P. C. K., 31.
- Shelley, the Character of, 285—compared with Byron, 286—various attempts to write his biography, 287—abundance of old and new material, 288—defects in Prof. Dowden's 'Life,' 288, 289—his cousin Harriet Grove, 290—idea of a union with his sister, 291—letters to Hogg, 292—hallucinations and delusions, 293—habit of petty fibbing, 294—dreams and visions, 294, 295—perverted and diseased moral character, 296—conduct towards Harriet Westbrook, 297—alienation, 298—love for Mary Godwin, 299—Peacock's testimony, *ib.*—Harriet's suicide, 300, 301—his theories upon marriage, 302—childhood, 303—taste for the black arts, *ib.*—at Oxford, 304—wayward and unaccountable, 305—his moral character and poetical genius, 306—ideality, 307—309—conceptive and dramatic faculty, 308—remoteness from human interests, 310—poetic defects and poetic excellencies, 311—lyric passion, *ib.*—advance in his Italian style, 312—'Queen Mab,' 'Revolt of Islam,' and 'Alastor,' 313—in Italy, 314—works when there, 315—'Julian' and 'Maddalo,' *ib.*—the 'Cenci,' 316—'Prometheus Unbound,' 317—the 'Witch of Atlas,' and 'Epipsychidion,' 318—'Adonais,' 319—gift of words, 320—Odes and Songs, 321.
- Simpson, Sir J. Y., 'Antiquarian Notes on Leprosy in the British Islands,' 194—on the rise and extinction of disease species, 198. See Epidemics.
- Sinnett, Mr. S., on the farm and crop mortgages in the West, 459.
- Smith, Sir D., completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, 132.
- Smyth, Major C., first advocate for the Canadian Pacific Railway, 120.
- Sole Bay, battle of, 402. See Suffolk.
- Stark, Mr. Emery, his evidence on the sale of next presentations, 187. See Church Patronage.
- Stephen, Mr. Lealie, 'Dictionary of National Biography,' 350.
- Suffolk, 382—old customs and peculiar dialect, 383—state of agriculture, rents, cows, horses, 384—crag, and chalk marl, 385—fishing, *ib.*—loss of life, 386—shooting and game-preserving, *ib.*—the Devil's Dyke, 387—Felix the first Bishop of Dunwich, 387, 403—Sigebert at Bury St. Edmunds, 388—legend of St. Edmund, *ib.*—meeting of the Barons to maintain their confederacy, 389—remarkable persons, *ib.*—flint churches and their round towers, 390—brasses, *ib.*—destruction by Will. Dowsing, the iconoclast, 391—the 'Black Death,' 392—preparations for an invasion from France, *ib.*—the Flemings clothiers and woollen manufacturers, 393—Wat Tyler's rebellion, *ib.*—Queen Mary's standard raised at Framlingham, *ib.*—Duke of Norfolk's imprisonment, 394—his funeral, 395—burning of Dr. Rowland Taylor, *ib.*—Lady Rous appointed Justice of the Peace, *ib.*—Queen Elizabeth's progress, 396—fate of young Rookwood, *ib.*—history of Euston, 396, 397—Robert Bloomfield, 397, 413—Hengrave, 397—Lady Penelope Darcy's three marriages, 398—Queen Elizabeth's restrictions to the clergy at Ipswich, *ib.*—troubles of the clergy, 399—the Associated Counties, 400—Lowestoft besieged by Cromwell, *ib.*—naval engagements with the Dutch, 401—Cornelius de Witte at the battle of Sole Bay, 402—Dunwich, 403—visions of S. Furseus, *ib.*—the see divided in two, 404—transferred to Thetford, *ib.*—encroachments of the sea, 405—distinguished families, 406—the Clares, 406, 407—Parham, 407—adventures of Lady Willoughby and her husband, 408—Wingfield, 409—Michael de la Pole, 409, 410—William de la Pole, 410—Stradbroke, Flixton, and Ipswich, *ib.*—Orwell, 411—Gainsborough, Constable, and

- Card. Wolsey, *ib.*—S. Gardiner, Bp. of Winchester, 412—N. Bacon, Sir J. Suckling, *ib.*—G. Crabbe, J. Bale, J. Steele, 413—Helmington, Henham, Stowlangtoft, 414—Sir Symond d'Ewes, *ib.*
 Symonds, Mr., on Shelley's feelings for Harriet Westbrook, 292. *See* Shelley.

T.

- Talpanhes, 72. *See* Daphne.
 Teaching University for London, proposals for, 52—second reports, 54—no promise of pecuniary support, 56.
 Tupper, Sir C., the Railway Department in his hands, 123—his resolutions in the House of Commons, 124.

U.

- United States, wheat-production, 452—average yield per acre, 453—gross return, 454—cost of growing an acre of wheat in Michigan, 457—farm and crop mortgages, 459.
 University of London, the, 33—its foundation, 38—charter granted, 39—Arnold on Scripture examination, 41—changes, 43—restrictions removed, 44—Lord Brougham persuades the Council to open evening classes, 45—new Charter of 1858, and certificate of studentship, 46—increase in number of candidates for matriculation, 47—Degrees in Science, 49—medical graduates, *ib.*—education of women, 50—Charter of 1878, 51—building in Burlington Gardens, *ib.*—Representative in the House of Commons, *ib.*—public usefulness, 52—proposals for a Teaching University, 52–55—advantage of reviving the collegiate system, 58—personal influence, 59—'Boards of Studies,' 60—Government plan of a Board of Examiners, 61—requirements for a medical degree, 64.

W.

- Walpole, H., description of Euston, 397.
 —, Mr. Spencer, 'History of England,' 507—claims comparison with Macaulay, 508. *See* History.
 Westbrook, Harriet, her supposed alienation from her husband, 298—suicide, 300. *See* Shelley.

- Wheat Growing, Competition in, 445—decrease in the area, *ib.*—reforms and concessions, 446—minimum or average cost of an acre, *ib.*—estimates published in the 'Mark Lane Express,' 447—Royal Agricultural Society at Woburn, *ib.*—expenses and receipts, 448—Railway charges, 449—average yield, 450—temporary glut of foreign imports, *ib.*—wheat acreage of the world, 451—flour imports, 452—Mr. Dodge on the current prices in the United States, 452—wheat acreage, 454—increase of the population, 455—Mr. Brook-walter on the produce of one acre in England compared with that of America, 456—cost in Michigan, 457—poverty of American growers, 458—Messrs. Read and Pell's testimony, *ib.*—Mr. F. Wilkeson on the Western farmers, 459—Mr. S. Sinnett on the farm and crop mortgages, *ib.*—the single crop system, 460—annual wheat crop in California, *ib.*—supplies from India, 461—cost of production, 462—Mr. A. R. Connell on the Indian cultivator and low rate of exchange, 463—condition of the agricultural classes in Russia, 464—average produce per acre, 465—flour from Austria-Hungary, 466—imports from Germany, *ib.*—area of crop in Australia, 467—New Zealand, *ib.*—exports in Canada, 468—acreage and produce in Ontario and Manitoba, 471—cold and long winter, 472—Major Bell's farm, 473—Chili and the Argentine Republic, 473, 474.
 Wiedemann, Dr. A., on the influence of Greek art in Egypt, 72.
 Winchester School, recent innovation in, 259, n.

Y.

- Yate, Lieut., on the designs of Russia, 222—estimates of the Persian forces, 230. *See* Constantinople.
 Young, A., on Suffolk 'Punches,' 384.
 Yule, Colonel, testimony to Mr. Burnell's co-operation in 'Hobson-Jobson,' 145. *See* Anglo-Indian.

END OF THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH VOLUME.

